WILLIAM R. KEY, CLERK.

BY D.C.

IN THE CRIMINAL COURT OF TENNESSEE

THE THIRTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

W200402240-CCA-R3-DD

STAT TENNESSEE,

Plaintiff.

Case No. 98-01034

VS.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

MICH DALE RIMMER,

Defendant.

RESENTENCING

JURY SELECTION, OPENING STATEMENTS
TRAILPT OF EVIDENCE, CLOSING ARGUMENTS AND JURY CHARGE
|ARY 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 12th and 13th, 2004

THE HONORABLE W. FRED AXLEY, PRESIDING JUDGE

Volumes 9 of 13 volumes

APPEARANCES

FORE STATE:

MR. THOMAS HENDERSON

MS. TRAYCE JONES

Assistant District Attorney Generals

Shelby County District Attorney's Office

201 Poplar Avenue

Third Floor

Memphis, Tennessee 38103

FOIE DEFENDANT:

MR. COLEMAN W. GARRETT

MR. PAUL SPRINGER

Attorneys at Law

605 Poplar Avenue

Memphis, Tennessee 38105

REPORTED BY: Charrel Gambill Official Court Reporter

FEB 0 3 2005

Clark of the Courts

Vol. 9

VOLUME FIVE TABLE OF CONTENTS

2		PAGE
3	Appearances	i
. 4	Table of Contents	i i
5	List of Exhibits	iii
	WILLIAM CONALEY	
6	Cross Examination	605
7	SANDY_YOUNG	
8	Direct Examination Cross Examination	608 611
9	ROSS HERRIN	
Ū	Direct Examination	612
10	Cross Examination	620
11	Friday, January 9, 2004	
10	T. J. HELLDORFER	
12	Direct Examination	623
13	Cross Examination	626
13	Redirect Examination	629
14	STACEY POWELL	
	Direct Examination	630
15	Cross Examination	.634
16	SERGEANT WILLIAM L. ASHTON	
.	Direct Examination	637
17	Cross Examination	645
18	Redirect Examination	665
19	LIEUTENANT ROBERT SHEMWELL	
'"	Direct Examination	668
20	Cross Examination (Jury out)	685
21	Proffer of proof	690
-	(Jury in) Continued Cross Examination	706
22	End of volume five	706 759
.	THE AT ACTUME TIME	139
23		

24

25

Page ii

VOLUME FIVE LIST OF EXHIBITS

2	<u>NUME</u>	BER BY	DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PAGE	VOLUME
3	30	STATE	Judgement sheets, identified by Ross Herrin as collective		
4			evidence.	620	V
5	31	STATE	Copy of map identified by R. Shemwell		
6			as evidence.	684	v
7	32	STATE	Redacted addendum to Darne statement, identified by R		
8			Shemwell for identification	n	
9			only.	718	V

Page iii

VOLUME FIVE

1		AOFOME LIAE
2	CROSS EXA	MINATION
3	BY MR. GA	RRETT:
4	Q.	Mr. Conaley, let me ask you a couple of questions
5	about you	r testimony. The statement that you attributed to
	Mr. Rimme	r took place in 1993; is that right?
6	Α.	Yes, sir.
7	Q.	Do you remember where you were at the time?
8	Α.	Neil Roane unit, sir.
9	Q.	Sir?
10	Α.	Neil Roane unit, it's the annex to Northwest
11	Correction	onal Center.
12	Q.	And where in that unit were you?
13	Α.	In my cell,
14	Q.	And was anybody else present in your cell?
15	A.	It could have been, my cell mate might have been,
16	but I'm n	
17	Q.	And so you don't recall whether anybody else heard
18		er than yourself?
19	A.	No, sir.
20	_	And that was in your cell? Was he visiting in your
21	Q.	And that was in your cell? was he visiting in your
22	cell?	V
23	Α.	Yes, sir.
24	Q.	Did he visit in your cell, often?
25	Α.	Yes, sir.

1	Q,	And that was in 193?
2	Α.	'93.
3	Q.	Heard no more from it, until you read it in the
4	paper	?
5	Α.	Yes, sir.
6	Q.	Who did you tell about this?
	Α.	Rhonda I guess her name back then was Pannell,
7	now i	t's Jordan.
8 9	Q.	Did you tell her by mail? Did you tell her in
10	perso	n? How did you tell her?
11	Q.	Face to face, sir.
12	Q.	And where were you when you told her face to face?
	Α.	My parents house.
13	Q.	And when was that?
14	Α.	I would say November of 1993.
15	Q.	And you made the same statement to her that you
16	testi	fied that Mr. Rimmer made to you?
17 18	Α.	Yes, sir.
19	Q.	And do you know if Rhonda informed Ms. Ellsworth?
20	Α.	Not to my knowledge, sir. I don't know.
21	Q.	You don't know?
22	Α.	No.
	Q.	And other than telling Rhonda in the conversation
23	that	you had with her while you were on furlough; is that
25	right	?

	Α.	Yes, sir.
2	Q.	In 1993?
3	Α.	Yes, sir.
4	Q,	Did you bring this to anybody else's attention?
5	Α.	No, sir.
6		MR. GARRETT: That's all, Your Honor.
7		THE COURT: Redirect?
8		MR. HENDERSON: Nothing further, Your Honor.
9		THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step down and
10	you're fro	ee to go about your business.
11		(Witness excused).
12		Call your next witness.
13		MS. JONES: Sandy Young.
14		SANDY YOUNG was called, sworn, examined and
15	testified	as follows:
16	DIRECT EX	AMINATION
17	BY MS. JO	NES:
18	Q.	Good afternoon, will you state your name and then
19	spell you	r last name?
20	Α,	My name is Sandra Young, Y-O-U-N-G.
21	Q.	And Ms. Young, where are you employed?
22	Α.	Shelby County Sheriff's Department.
23	Q.	And which department do you work for?
24	Α.	I work for R & I.
25	Q,	And what does R & I stand for?

whenever you come through the system and if you've been here

Records and Identification division.

Α.

1

1 been here before, you get a brand new one. They start with 2 one and I believe we're up to three-hundred-twenty-something-3 thousand, now. So everybody gets their own individual 4 number. 5 So it's a number that's uniquely assigned to each Q. 6 individual that comes in? 7 Yes, ma'am. Α. 8 Q, And if that person is arrested once, or numerous 9 times, they keep that same number? 10 Α. Yes, ma'am. 11 And you're able to match that number up with them Q. 12 through fingerprints? 13 Yes, ma'am. Α. 14 Q. Okay. And you keep files, or records of this? 15 Α. Yes, ma'am. 16 Q. And are you familiar with how these records are 17 kept? 18 Α, Yes, ma'am. 19 Q, And are they kept in the regular course of your 20 business? 21 Yes, ma'am. Α. 22 And is there a duty to keep these records Q. 23 accurately? 24

Yes, ma'am.

Α.

25

before you get the same R & I number. But, if you haven't

1	Q.	Okay. Pursuant to a subpoena, did you bring
2	records	with an R & I number 5-8-1-5-9?
3	Α.	Yes, ma'am.
4	Q.	And is there a fingerprint contained in that
5	record,	also?
6	Α.	Yes, it belongs to a Michael Dale Rimmer, R-I-M-M
7	E-R.	
8	Q.	So that is who that R & I number is assigned to?
9	Α.	Yes, ma'am.
10		MS. JONES: I have nothing further, Your Honor.
11		THE COURT: Cross-examine?
12		MR. SPRINGER: Yes, sir. I just have a couple of
13	question	s, Your Honor.
14	CROSS-EX	AMINATION
15	BY MR. S	PRINGER:
16	Q.	Could you tell me how many fingerprint technicians
17	that you	have in your office?
18	Α.	In our office, on our shift, we have seven. And
19		ther, I believe, there's twenty fingerprint
20	technici	ans, from all three shifts.
21	Q.	So no matter whoever is booked into jail, one of
22	l	hose fingerprints pass to some technician to verify
23		hing R & I number?
24	A .	Yes, sir. We are open twenty-four hours a day.
_	Q.	And that is always a fingerprint technician that

1	does that	?
2	Α.	Yes, sir.
3		MR. SPRINGER: I have no further questions.
4		THE COURT: Redirect?
5		MS. JONES: I have nothing further.
6		THE COURT: Thank you, you may step down. You're
7	free to go	ο.
8		(Witness excused).
9		Call your next witness.
10		MS. JONES: Ross Herrin.
11		ROSS HERRIN was called, sworn, examined and
12		as follows:
13	DIRECT EX	
14	BY MS. JOI	
15	Q.	Good afternoon, will you state your name and spell
16		name, please?
17	Α.	Ross Herrin, H-E-R-R-I-N.
18	Q.	Okay. And where are you employed, Mr. Herrin?
19	Α.	Criminal Court Clerk's Office.
20	Q. A.	And what is your position with the Clerk's Office? Keeper of the records.
21	Q.	Okay. And as keeper of the records are you
22		with how the records are kept?
23	Α.	Yes, I am.
24	Q.	And are the records kept in the regular course of
25	ν.	me ere one receive releting the results course of

1	business?	
2	Α.	Yes, they are.
3	Q.	And is there a duty to keep them accurately?
4	Α.	There is.
5	Q.	Pursuant to a subpoena did you bring a record
6	concernir	ng indictment numbers 85-00448?
7	Α.	Yes, I did.
8	Q.	And 85-00449?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	89-02736?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	89-02737?
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	And 89-02738?
15	Α,	Yes.
16	Q.	In reference to indictment 85-00448, do you have
17	that?	
18	Α.	I do.
19	Q.	Who is the defendant named in that indictment?
20	Α.	Michael Rimmer.
21	Q.	And is there an R & I number with that indictment?
22	Α.	I do not have one on the copies, but I do on the
23	original	file.
23	Q.	And are those copies of the information that was on
25	the origi	nal file?
ŀ	1	

1	A.	rney are.							
2	Q.	And are those certified copies?							
3	Α.	Yes, they are.							
	Q.	Okay. And what number is indicated on the original							
4	file, 85	-00448?							
5	Α.	The R & I number is 5-8-1-5-9.							
6	Q.	And in that indictment what is the charge?							
7	Α.	Assault with intent to commit robbery with a deadly							
8	weapon.								
9	Q.	And is there a disposition of that charge							
10	indicate	đ?							
11	Α.	Yes, there is.							
12	Q.	And would you state that to the jury, please?							
13	Α.	Mr. Rimmer pled guilty to assault with intent to							
14	commit robbery with a deadly weapon on June the 10th, 1985.								
15	Mr. Rimm								
16	Q.	Does it indicate the sentence?							
17	Α.	(No audible reply).							
18	Q.	Are you looking at the judgement sheet?							
19	Α.	I'm sorry. These are old judgement sheets.							
20		not up to date ones, like we have today. Give me							
21	just a mo								
22		(A brief pause was had in the proceedings).							
23		Yes, five years.							
24	Q.								
25	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	And also do you have the file for indictment 85-							

Yes, ma'am, I do. Α. 2 On that indictment, what is the name of the Q. 3 defendant? Michael Dale Rimmer. Α. 5 And what R & I number is indicated on that file? Q. 6 5-8-1-5-9. Α. 7 Q, And would you tell the jury the charge and 8 disposition of that case? Α. Mr. Rimmer was charged with aggravated assault on 10 June 10th, 1985 and he pled guilty to five years. 11 And do those two indictment numbers, the sentences, 12 did they run concurrently, or consecutively? 13 They were both concurrently. Α. 14 And what does that mean? Can you explain it to Q, 15 the jury? 16 Α. That means when he serves one five year sentence, 17 he serves them both at the same time. 18 Also, Mr. Herrin did you bring a file for Q, 19 indictment number 89-02736 as well as certified copies of the 20 judgement sheet and indictment? 21 Yes, I did. Α. 22 And for indictment 89-02736, who is the defendant? 0. 23 Michael Rimmer. Α. 24 And is there an R & I number associated with that Q. 25

00449, as well as certified copies of the judgement sheets?

file?

- A. Yes, there is, 5-8-1-5-9.
- Q. And what was the charge and disposition of that case?
- A. Mr. Rimmer was charged with burglary, first degree on June the 6th, 1989. He pled guilty to ten years.
- Q. And you also brought a certified copy of the indictment in that case?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And could you read to the jury what the indictment states?
- A. The indictment reads; "State of Tennessee, Shelby County, Criminal Court of Shelby County, January term 1989, the grand jurors of the State of Tennessee, duly elected, impaneled, sworn and charge to inquire in and for the body of the County of Shelby and the State aforesaid, upon their oath present that Michael Dale Rimmer, late of the County aforesaid, heretofore, to-wit; on the 14th day of January, 1989, before the finding of this indictment in the County of aforesaid, did commit the offense of burglary in the first degree by unlawfully, feloniously and burglarously, break into and entering the mansion house of Ricci Ellsworth, in the night time with intent, unlawfully and feloniously to commit the felony of aggravated assault upon the person of Ricci Ellsworth".

Q. And I believe that you stated that the sentence in that case -- that he pled guilty and was sentenced to serve ten years?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. You also brought the file for indictment 89-02737, along with certified copies of the judgement sheet and indictment; is that correct?
- A. That is correct.
- Q. And who is the defendant in that case?
- A. It's Michael Dale Rimmer.
- Q. And what R & I number is attached to that?
- A. 5-8-1-5-9.
- Q. And does it show a charge and disposition of that case?
- A. Yes, it does.
- Q. Would you relay that to the jury, please?
- A. The charge was aggravated assault. Mr. Rimmer pled to that charge on the 6th day of June, 1989. He was sentenced to five years.
- Q. And would you please read the indictment in that case?
- A. "State of Tennessee, Shelby County, Criminal Court of Shelby County, January term 1989, the grand jurors of the State of Tennessee, duly elected, impaneled, sworn and charge to inquire in and for the body of the County of Shelby and

the State aforesaid, upon their oath present that Michael Dale Rimmer, late of the County aforesaid, heretofore, to-wit; on the 14th day of January, 1989, before the finding of this indictment in the County of aforesaid, did unlawfully feloniously and willfully cause bodily injury to Ricci Ellsworth, under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to the value of human life".

- Q. And as you stated he pled guilty to that on June the 6th, of 1989 to five years; is that correct?
- A. That is correct.
- Q. You also brought with you file 89-02738 as well as certified copies of the judgement sheets for that indictment?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Who is the defendant in that case?
- A. Michael Dale Rimmer.
- Q. And what R & I number is on the file?
- A. 5-8-1-5-9.
- Q. And what is the charge and disposition of that case?
- A. The charge is rape on the 6th day of June, 1989. Mr. Rimmer pled guilty to that charge and was sentenced to ten years.
- Q. And would you read the indictment to the jury, please?
- A. "State of Tennessee, Shelby County, Criminal Court

of Shelby County, January term 1989, the grand jurors of the State of Tennessee, duly elected, impaneled, sworn and charge to inquire in and for the body of the County of Shelby and the State aforesaid, upon their oath present that Michael Dale Rimmer, late of the County aforesaid, heretofore, towit; on the 14th day of January, 1989, before the finding of this indictment in the County of aforesaid, did unlawfully and feloniously and forcibly sexually penetrate, Ricci Ellsworth, thereby committing the offense of rape".

- Q. And you stated that he pled guilty to that on June 6th, of 1989 and sentenced to serve ten years?
- A. That is correct.
- Q. And does it indicate how those sentences were to run? Consecutively, or concurrently?
- A. This sentence was to serve concurrently.
- Q. And what does that mean?
- A. It means that when he was sentenced to ten years he served this, along with the other years, at the same time.
- Q. And you brought certified copies of the judgement sheets, as well as the indictments with you; is that correct?
- A. That is correct.

MS. JONES: Your Honor, we ask that this be marked as collective exhibits thirty.

THE COURT: Yeah, okay. Any objections.

MR. GARRETT: No, Your Honor.

2 Herrin. 3 (Exhibit number thirty was marked and filed for 4 record as collective evidence.) 5 MS. JONES: I have no further questions, Your 6 Honor, 7 THE COURT: Cross? 8 MR. GARRETT: Just a couple of questions. 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. GARRETT: 11 Mr. Herrin, do all of the charges and convictions Q. 12 that you have just read to the jury involve Mr. Michael 13 Rimmer; is that correct? 14 That is correct. Α. 15 And they were disposed of by guilty pleas on his Q. 16 part; is that right? 17 That is correct. Α. 18 Q, And for the sake of the jury, does that mean that 19 he did not go to trial on any of these? 20 That is correct. Α. 21 Q, None of these cases were heard by a Judge? 22 That is correct. Α. 23 MR. GARRETT: That's all. 24 THE COURT: Any redirect? 25

1

THE COURT: Show them as a collective exhibit

number thirty into evidence, through the honorable Ross

1 THE COURT: Step down, please, sir. 2 (Witness excused). 3 Call your next witness. MR. HENDERSON: May we approach the bench for a 5 second? 6 THE COURT: Yeah. 7 (A bench conference was held on the record 8 in the presence of the jury, but out of it's 9 hearing and the following proceedings were 10 had, to-wit:) 11 MR. HENDERSON: We've run out of witnesses for 12 today and we're now down to our last five. 13 THE COURT: I thought you had them here for 14 tonight? Can you get them here in the morning? 15 MR. HENDERSON: I'll have them here in the morning. 16 THE COURT: So you'll have them? 17 MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir. We have Ms. Zavaro 18 coming in from Nashville and the other's are all here, or I 19 mean, here in town. 20 THE COURT: Who's coming in from Nashville? 21 MR. HENDERSON: Samera Zavaro. That's the lady 22 from the T. B. I. lab. 23 THE COURT: Oh, yeah. 24 MR. HENDERSON: And that's as to the chain of 25

MS. JONES: No further questions, Your Honor.

custody.

THE COURT: I want to see you spell it, without asking.

MR. HENDERSON: I had to spell it off of my trial notebook.

THE COURT: Well, she doesn't even look like a Samera Zavaro.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, at least she doesn't look like Freda Saharovicci.

THE COURT: Oh, my God, who does? All right. I'll tell the jury what's going on. Thank you.

(Said bench conference having been completed,
the following proceedings were had in the presence
of the jury:)

THE COURT: We have one witness for the state that has to come from Nashville and will be here in the morning.

The balance of the proof will be tomorrow, with the state.

I'm satisfied they'll rest their case tomorrow.

In the meantime, don't discuss that case among yourselves, or allow anyone to discuss it with you. Step out.

(Court adjourned at 5:00 p.m. continuing this cause for trial to Friday, January 9, 2004, when the following proceedings were had in the presence of the jury.)

Page 622

MR. HENDERSON: I'd call Officer Helldorfer. T. J. HELLDORFER was called, sworn, examined and 3 testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. HENDERSON 6 Tell us your full name, please, sir? Q. 7 T. J. Helldorfer, H-E-L-L-D-O-R-F-E-R. Α. 8 Q. Where are you employed? 9 City of Memphis Police Department. 10 How long have you been employed by the police Q. 11 department? 12 Twenty-four and a half years. 13 Where are you assigned right now? Q, 14 Homicide bureau. Α. 15 How long have you been assigned there? Q. 16 Nearly eight years. 17 Can I direct your attention back to 1997 and 1998, Q. 18 were you in homicide back then? 19 Yes, I was. Α. 20 Did you participate in the investigation in the Q. 21 case of a murder of Ricci Ellsworth? 22 Α. I did. 23 At some point did you look for the suspect, Michael Q. 24 Rimmer? 25

THE COURT: Call your next witness.

Α.

Yes, I did.

Yes, sir, I did. Α. Q, And what was your contact with that automobile? 2 I met the wrecker driver that brought the car back Α. 3 at Frayser Boulevard and Danny Thomas and he followed me to our crime scene tunnel and it was off-loaded at that 5 location. 6 And as you observed the car how was it prepared, or Q. 7 sealed, while it was on this truck? Α. It was wrapped up with a blue tarp. And was it being towed with it's wheels on the 10 ground, or was it on a flat bed, or what? 11 It was on a flat bed. Α. 12 Was it covered in any way? 13 Covered with a tarp. 14 At some point in 1998 were you asked to go to the Q. 15 Memphis Inn to see about photographing a crack in a sink in a 16 bath room? 17 Yes, I did. Α. 18 Did you try to do that? 19 I tried, but we had problems with our camera. 20 flash on the Polaroid it whited out -- with the porcelain 21 finish, it whited out the crack and we just couldn't see the 22 crack. 23 Q, With your naked eye could you see the crack? 24 Α. Oh, it was obvious, yes.

1	Q.	So since you couldn't photograph it, what did you
2	do?	
3	Α.	I took the sink.
4		MR. HENDERSON: Your Honor, if I could ask the
5	deputies	to help or could I ask the witness to step down
6	and appro	pach this exhibit.
7		THE COURT: Yeah, why don't you do that.
8	Q,	If you will step down here and approach exhibit
9	number tl	nree for us, please and tell me if you recognize
10	that?	
11	Α.	Yes, this is the sink that I took from the Inn.
12	Q,	Is that in the same condition that you took it in
13	at that t	ime?
14	Α,	It is.
15		MR. HENDERSON: I have no further questions of this
16	witness,	Your Honor.
17		THE COURT: All right. You may cross-examine.
18		MR. SPRINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	CROSS-EXA	MINATION
20	BY MR. SI	PRINGER:
21	Q.	Officer Helldorfer, when was the first time that
22	you made	a trip to Mississippi?
23	Α.	The very first time?
24	Q.	Yes.
25	Α.	Oh, probably either the day that we went to the

Q,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

scene, or maybe the next day.

Q. What day did you make it to the scene?

A. February the 8th of '97. We were probably down there for the first two weeks, every day.

- Q. Okay. Now, how many trips, in all, did you make down to Mississippi?
- A. Easily a dozen.
- Q. And did you all have a plan for searching for a victim? And I believe that you were searching for Mr.

Rimmer; as well?

- A. Primarily, we were looking for the victim at that point.
- Q. Now, did you all have a plan, actually, for looking for a victim? Was there anything based upon the time that this may have happened? How far an individual may have been able to travel from that point? What guided you in that particular direction?
- A. To his brother's house?
- Q. Yes.
- A. The investigation took us to his brother's house.

 After talking with Richard Rimmer he admitted that he had been to the house.
- Q. Okay. Now, did you go any other places besides Nesbitt, Mississippi?
- A. We went down to Arkabutla.

What I'm trying to get at, did you organize this

Q.

in Memphis?

Page 629

north side of the lake. To get to that location it is a car path, basically, that you could see the wheel tracks to the very end. There is a picnic table there. It's a little bit higher than the water table. And then there's a boat launch ramp that you could launch a flat bed boat, if you wanted to.

Q. Does the water table at that part of the lake

- Q. Does the water table at that part of the lake change during the year?
- A. Dramatically. Yes, it does.
- Q. Without telling us what the reason was, did you have a reason to restrict your search to those two areas in Mississippi?
- A. Yes.

MR. HENDERSON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Recross?

MR. SPRINGER: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down. You're free to go about your business.

(Witness excused).

Call your next witness.

MS. JONES: Stacey Powell.

STACEY POWELL was called, sworn, examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. JONES:

Q. State your name and spell your last name?

A. My name's Stacey Powell, last name is spelled, P-O-W-E-L-L.

- Q. And Ms. Powell, where are you currently employed?
- A. I'm currently employed as a family practitioner in private practice and I also work for Memphis Sexual Assault Resource Center, in the capacity of sexual assault nurse examiner.
- Q. And in 1997, were you employed as a nurse practitioner then?
- A. Yes, I was.
- Q. And where were you employed?
- A. At the Memphis Sexual Assault Resource Center.
- Q. And as a nurse practitioner what type of educational training does that require?
- A. That requires a nursing degree, bachelor's of science in nursing. It also requires further education as a master prepared nurse with certification, specifically to family nurse practitioner's, board certified.
- Q. And what were your duties and responsibilities as a nurse practitioner at the sexual assault center back in 1997?
- As a nurse practitioner at the sexual assault resource center we provided forensic exams on patients who come in for -- who have been sexually assaulted, for either collection of evidence, or any type of evidence for forensic exams.

And collecting evidence, would that include taking

Q.

15.

 Would you explain that to the jury?

A. Sure. The procedure used to collect blood from Ms. Floyd was, first we use gloves, put gloves on and obtain a blank container, with a needle, and a container for the blood. We raise the sleeve up and a turnick was applied, blood is drawn with a needle and put into a tube.

- Q. And what did you do with the blood in that tube?
- A. I put the blood in that tube and I went into the forensic lab that we have. I put on another pair of gloves and took a sterile needle, extracted the blood out of the tube and put the blood on a blood standard.
- Q. Would you explain to the jury what a standard is?
- A. A standard is a cardboard for blood to be applied, so that it is dried blood. And it is for the sole purpose of DNA testing.
- Q. And once you created this standard, what did you do with it?
- A. Once I created the standard under sterile technique, I made sure that I had a mask on and that I was behind a glass seal, so that that would prevent contamination of the blood sample and the DNA standard as I was dropping the blood onto the cardboard. Once I completed that, I seal the cardboard and discarded the blood from the tube into the sharp container so that there would be no further injury from glass. So I filled the blood standard and put it into an

envelope kit. We call it paternity testing kit.

- And when you sealed the envelope, did you initial this envelope in any way?
- I initialed the envelope and also I presented the envelope to the officer and he signed it and I signed it,
- And when you say you presented it to the officer, did you give the envelope to Officer Shemwell?
- Yes.
- And after you gave it to him, did you do anything else with the sample? Did you have any further contact with the blood sample?
- No, I had no further contact with the sample.
- That was your involvement in this case?
- Yes.

MS. JONES: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: You may cross-examine.

MR. SPRINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SPRINGER:

- Ms. Powell, I have a few questions for you, please.
- Okay.
- How much blood, exactly, did you draw from Ms.

About six cc's.

Page 634

Q.	Okay	. And	if	you	could	for	the	jury,	could	you
explain	about 1	how m	ich	six	cc's o	f blo	ood i	is?		

- A. About that much blood, (indicating), in a tube that was about that high (indicating), and that much blood.
- Q. And now you explained the process and as I understand the process of the way you explained it, you drew the six cc's of blood and then you took a syringe, after you changed gloves and made sure that the whole process was sterile?
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And blotted the blood on the standard?
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And why did you blot the blood on the standard?
- A. The blood is blotted on the standard to provide DNA testing and to maintain the safety and security of the chain of custody evidence.
- Q. And so attributed prior to drawing Ms. Floyd's blood that this was going to be used for DNA testing?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And after you did the blood standard, what did you do? How much blood was used in the blood standard?
- A. Probably, about two cc's.
- Q. And so you had approximately four cc's of blood remaining?
- A. Yes.

,	Q. And what happened to the other four cc's of blood	đ?
2	A. That vile was put into a sharpies container, with	hi
3	our laboratory for discarding.	
4	Q. And so, that is destroyed after you made the	
5	standard?	
6	A. Yes, sir. Because it is in the container, so it	's
7	inaccessible.	
8	Q. And the standard is sealed, as you stated, and in	n
9	this particular incident it was immediately turned over to	
10	Officer Shemwell?	
11	A. After being properly sealed and signed, yes.	
2	Q. Did you give Officer Shemwell any other evidence	?
	Did he request any other evidence, or did you give him any	
3	other evidence, except for that blood standard?	
14	A. No, no other evidence, sir.	
15	MR. SPRINGER: If I could have just a moment, You	ur
6	Honor?	
7 18	THE COURT: Yes.	
19	(A brief pause was had in the proceedings).	
20	MR. SPRINGER: Your Honor, I have no further	
21	questions.	
	THE COURT: Any redirect?	
22	MS. JONES: Nothing further, Your Honor.	
23	THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am, you're free to go	
.4 !5	about your business.	
.~		

Call your next witness. MS. JONES: Sergeant Ashton. 3 WILLIAM L. ASHTON was called, sworn, examined and testified as follows: 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 BY MS. JONES: 7 Q. Good morning, Sergeant Ashton. Good morning. Α. Would you state your name and spell your last name, 0. 10 please? 11 Α. Sergeant William L. Ashton, A-S-H-T-O-N. 12 Q. And where are you employed? 13 Memphis Police Department. Α. 14 Q. And what bureau are you assigned and what is your 15 classification and assignment? 16 I'm a Sergeant in the homicide bureau. 17 investigate homicides. 18 Q. And how long have you been doing that? 19 Going on eight years now. Α. 20 So you were employed in homicide, in 1997? Q. 21 Α. Yes, ma'am. 22 In 1997, I believe in March of 1997, did you have Q. 23 an occasion to go to Franklin, Indiana?

(Witness excused).

Yes, ma'am, I did.

Α.

1	Q.	And why did you do that?
2	Α.	I went up there to interview Michael Rimmer, in
3	regard to	a case that we were investigating?
4	Q.	And did any other officers from the Memphis Police
5	Departmen	nt go with you?
6	Α.	Sergeant Shemwell and Sergeant Wilkinson
7	accompani	ed me up there.
8	Q.	And where was Michael Rimmer in Indiana, when you
9	went to s	ee him?
10	Α.	He was in the county jail.
11	Q.	And when you refer to Michael Rimmer, do you see
12	him prese	ent in the courtroom today?
13	Α.	Yes, ma'am, he'll be sitting right behind defense
14	counsel,	dressed in the blue shirt.
15		MS. JONES: Let the record reflect that he has
16	identifie	d the defendant, Michael Rimmer.
17		THE COURT: You may proceed.
18	Q.	And when you arrived in the Johnson City jail, did
19	you have	an opportunity to interview Michael Rimmer?
20	Α.	Yes, ma'am, I did.
21	Q,	And how many times did you interview him?
22	Α.	Two days.
23	Q.	Two days?
24	Α.	Yes, ma'am.
25	Q.	Would that be March the 6th of 1997 and March the

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7th of 1997?

- Yes, ma'am. Α.
- On March the 6th of 1997, when you interviewed the Q. defendant, did you introduce yourself?
- Yes, ma'am. Both Sergeant Wilkinson and myself introduced ourselves and told him who we were and where we were from.
- You were the two officers present during this Q. interview?
- Yes, ma'am. Α.
- Was anyone else present besides the defendant? Q.
- No, ma'am. Α.
- So the three of you? Q.
- Yes, ma'am Α.
- And after you introduced yourselves, did you advise Q, the defendant of his rights?
- Yes, ma'am, we did. Α.
- Q. And did he agree to speak with you at that time?
- Yes, ma'am, he did.
- Now, once you began this interview, did you advise Q. him of why you were there?
- Sergeant Wilkinson advised him that we need to talk to him about the car that he was driving when he was arrested. And when he did that, Michael Rimmer kind of got a relaxed posture and kind of calmed down. And he said, "Oh,

.7

you must think the car is stolen". He said, "I can clear that up just like that when we get back to Memphis".

- Q. And did he question about anything else?
- A. Well, after that, we advised him that we wanted to talk to him about Ricci.
- Q. And how did he react to that?
- A. Well, after we told him that we wanted to talk to him about Ricci, Sergeant Wilkinson didn't say another word and I didn't say another word. We just sat there in silence. And Michael, you could see this anxiety come over him and he would look at Sergeant Wilkinson and look back at me and we were at opposite ends of the table, back and forth and back and forth. And finally, he was putting out his hands, 'What, what, what"? And he got real excited and agitated.
- Q. You said that you were sitting at opposite ends of the table?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Could you explain to the jury where you were sitting and where Officer Wilkinson was sitting and where the defendant was sitting, so that they could get an idea?
- A. Yes, ma'am. In this room where we were in there was a table, about the length of the table that you see the attorneys sitting at here. And probably about twice as wide. Michael Rimmer was sitting at the very end, in a chair at that end. Sergeant Wilkinson was sitting directly across

from him in a chair at the side of the table there. And then, I took a chair about two or three chairs back up the table, away from him up here, to kind of put a distance between all of us.

- Q. So the defendant was sitting at one end of the table?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Wilkinson was sitting on the side of the defendant?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And you were sitting opposite?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And the defendant was looking back and forth at v'all?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. After he questioned you, "What about Ricci"? What did you proceed to do?
- A. Well, we told him, at first, that Ricci was missing. And he said, "Oh that can be cleared up, she's probably gone home to her mother in Alabama, she does it all the time." And then we told him, "No, we think Ricci is dead". And his response to that was, "She's not dead, you don't have the body".
- Q. At any time prior to him making that statement had you informed him that you had not found the body?
- A. No, ma'am.

Q.	After he made that statement, did your interview
continue?	
Α.	Yes, ma'am. We continued on in the interview and
he kept d	enying any knowledge of anything about the homicide.

- Q. All right. During this phase of the interview did you ever question him on why he had left Memphis?
- A. Yes, ma'am. We asked him why he suddenly just up and left Memphis.
- Q. What did he tell you?
- A. He said it was his nature just to get up and leave like that.
- Q. Do you recall how long this interview was?
- A. Not off the top of my head. I could look at the supplement and I could give you the times off of that.
- Q. Do you think it was more than an hour?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And did you have any breaks during this interview?

We took numerous breaks during the interview.

- Michael would ask us to take a bath room break, smoke a cigarette, go get water and this happened, quite frequently. I thought this was awful strange, as much water as he was drinking. But, we had to stop and we'd go get him some water and let him use the bathroom. We stepped outside the back
- Q. You also interviewed him on March 7th of 1997, so

door and let him smoke several cigarettes during this.

that was the very next day?

- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And do you recall if you continued that interview in the morning, or the afternoon?
- A. To the best of my recollection it was around 9:00, or 9:30 in the morning.
- Q. And who was present on this second day?
- A. It would have been Michael Rimmer, myself and Sergeant Wilkinson, again.
- Q. And did you have the same basic seating arrangement as you had the day prior?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And during this interview would you describe for the jury what the defendant's demeanor was?
- A. He was very agitated and hostile towards us at that time.
- Q. And when you say "hostile", was he doing certain things that made you decide he was hostile?
- A. For no apparent reason, while talking to him, he would just have an out-burst and start cussing us and screaming and hollering and you know acting in, what I'd say is hostile. And when it was brought to his attention, "Michael, we haven't said a cuss word to you, we haven't raised our voices, why are you acting this way?" And then he would catch himself and calm down and apologize for his out-

1

burst. But, these out-burst happened several times.

- But, he had agreed to speak with you again on this? Q.
- Yes, ma'am. Α.
- Q. Do you recall if the defendant ever indicated why he was hostile? What caused him to be hostile with you?
- He never told us why he was acting out like that. Α,
- Sergeant Ashton, were you also involved in Q. transporting some evidence in this case from Memphis to the T. B. I. lab?
- Yes, ma'am, I was.
- Okay. And you transported some evidence from the crime scene as well as from the car that the defendant was driving in when he was arrested?
- Yes, ma'am. Α.
- Q. And did you transport a car to the T. B. I.?
- Α, I escorted the car up there. I had a city wrecker meet me. We had the car confined out at our crime scene unit and we had it under a tarp. And I had a city wrecker meet me there and we put it on the back of a city wrecker and I had them follow me to Nashville, so I could monitor the transfer of that evidence up there.
- Q. So you did monitor the transfer of the vehicle?
- Α. Yes, ma'am.
- And you delivered it to the T. B. I. in Nashville? 0.
- Yes, ma'am, I did. Α,

1 Honor. 2 MR. GARRETT: CROSS-EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. GARRETT: Q, 7 8 Ms. Ricci; isn't that correct? 10 That's correct, sir. Α. 11 Q, 12 13 Α. 14 Q, 15 16 17 Rimmer? 18 Α. No, sir. 19 Q, 20 you first got there? 21 22 23 Q. 24 Α. Yes, sir. 25

MS. JONES: I have no further questions, Your THE COURT: You may cross-examine. Thank you, Judge. Sergeant Ashton, throughout your conversations with and interviews of Michael Rimmer, he consistently denied knowing anything about anything about any disappearance of Now, how did y'all travel to Indiana? Did y'all fly, or drive together, how did you get there? We flew on a commercial airline. Did you make any preparations for this interview before you left Memphis? Did you have a plan as to how y'all were going to approach this, in your interview with Mr. Who did you talk to to get to see Mr. Rimmer when We met with a couple of Sheriff's Deputies from that jurisdiction up there. They met us at the airport. They met you at the airport?

- Q. And where did you go from there?
- A. We landed in Indianapolis, they took us to Franklin, they drove us by to show us where the jail was so that we could get there in the morning, because we got there late that night and then we went to the hotel for the evening.
- Q. Did you ever talk to the local officers about the reason for you being there and what you planned to do?
- A. They knew why we were there, sir.
- Q. So there was no need -- you didn't have any discussion with them regarding that; is that correct?
- A. I wasn't the case coordinator. You'd have to ask Sergeant Shemwell those questions, sir.
- Q. And Sergeant Shemwell and Officer Wilkinson, I believe you said, were with you; is that correct?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And so you went to the hotel that night and you got up the next morning, what time? And what time did you move out to complete your mission?
- A. I would probably think that we got up around 7:00, or 8:00 o'clock, had breakfast and made our way over to the county jail.
- Q. You went directly to the county jail?
- A. From where?
- Q. From the hotel, or from wherever you had breakfast?

From where I had breakfast to the jail, yes, sir.

Α,

Q,

1	A. No, sir.
2	Q. Was there any equipment in this room where this
3	table was? Any electronic equipment of any type?
4	A. I recall a telephone being in there, but other than
5	that, I don't recall what else was in that room.
6	Q. Did you have any recording equipment? Did you have
7	a tape recorder?
8	A. No, sir.
9	Q. Did anybody discuss the possibility of having a
10	tape recorder to record this interview so we could preserve
11	it forever so there would be no question about what was said?
12	A. You'd have to ask Sergeant Shemwell, the case
13	coordinator about that, I wasn't in on that.
14	Q. Let me ask you, did you make any mention that we
15	should have a tape recorder, so there will be no question
16	about what was said here?
17	A. No, sir.
18	Q. Was there any discussion of that in your presence?
19	A. I don't recall that being discussed, sir.
20	Q. In your experience as a homicide investigator with
21	the Memphis Police Department, is it common for you to use
22	tape recorders to record interviews of suspects?
23	A. In the almost eight years that I've been there, no,
24	sir.

Is there some reason that you don't do that?

Α.	J	Ldor	ı't	make	policies	for	the	police	department.	1
don't	know	the	rea	ason.						

- Q. Are you saying that the police department's policy is not to use recorders?
- A. I don't know what their policy is on that, sir. I know in my time at the homicide squad, that's never happened. We've never had that happen.
- Q. You've been there with the police department for eight years as a homicide investigator and you don't know what the policy is?
- A. I do the job, when they ask me to do the job and I don't question it, sir. They don't provide me with recording equipment. If they thought I needed it, I would have it.
- Q. This first interview took place on what date, sir?
- A. If you'll pass forward my supplement I can give you the date off there, sir.

MR. GARRETT: May the witness be passed his supplement, please?

THE COURT: Hand it to him, yes, sir. (Document tendered to witness).

- A. Thank you.
- Q. Can you identify the document that you were just passed and tell us what the date is on that and what it is, officer?
- A. Yes, sir. This is a supplement that we write in

the homicide bureau. These would be notes of what took place, what time and the date. And this one is titled, "Sergeant W. L. Ashton, 0-0-7-7", which is myself, and "Sergeant R. F. Wilkinson, number 9-2-4-3" and it's titled "Interview Michael Rimmer 3-06-97". And then, the next line down is "Thursday, 3-06-97".

- Q. And how many pages is that document? How long is that document?
- A. This particular supplement is one and a half pages long.
- Q. One and a half typed-written pages long?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Was that prepared by yourself, officer?
- A. Yes, sir, I typed that.
- Q. And it was made a part of your official record in this case?
- A. It was made a part of the official record in this case; yes, sir.
- Q. Now, so this first interview, according to your statement and refreshing your recollection, took place on March 6th, of 1997; is that correct?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. What time did y'all start the interview with Mr. Rimmer?
- A. It indicates here at 17:00 hours, which would be

5:00 p.m. in the afternoon.

- Q. Did y'all do anything by way of further investigation on this case from the early morning hours, until 5:00 p.m. in the afternoon?
- A. Yes, sir, we did.
- Q. Can you tell me what you did during that time?
- A. A search warrant had been received for the car that Michael Rimmer was arrested in, in Indiana. And the Indiana authorities were there, their crime scene people and that car was inventoried and evidence was gathered from that car and that happened during the morning hours before this.
- Q. Were you present when that evidence was gathered?
- A. I was in the room.
- Q. Were you present when the evidence was given from the car?
- A. Yes, sir, I was in the room.
- Q. What room was the car in?
- A. They had, I guess for lack of a better explanation, it was like a bay where they could drive the car in, close the door behind it and it was sort of like a garage, maybe.

 And this is where they processed their evidence and gathered evidence.
- Q. And who was gathering evidence from this vehicle?
- A. There was a couple of Indiana officers that were there. And I want to say that the man who was in charge of

)

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

their crime unit was a Lieutenant Bill Baldwin, or a Sergeant Bill Baldwin. I believe that's his name. I can't recall.

And then there was a criminalist there, but I can't remember his name.

- Q. Did any Memphis officers participate in the gathering of evidence from this vehicle?
- A. Sergeant Shemwell, the case coordinator was in there and he was making notes as they was gathering evidence.
- Q. And you were present also, when this was going on?
- A. I was in the room and maybe I would walk out and come back in. I wasn't part of the people, actually gathering the evidence, myself, but I was there part of the time.
- Q. Were you there when a piece of the seat was cut out for evidence purposes?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. What color was this vehicle?
- A. The best of my recollection it was maroon colored.
- Q. What was the color of the interior?
- A. I don't recall. I didn't get in the car and cut the seat. I don't recall.
- Q. Do you remember looking in there?
- A. I looked at the car, but to say that I can remember the color of the seat, I couldn't do that.
- Q. You just don't remember the color?

Q.

A. I can't tell you the color of the coat I had on yesterday.

Q. But, you were present when this sample was cut out of the seat, I believe you said; is that right?

A. Yes, sir, I was.

Q. What happened to that seat?

A. You'd have to look in the record to see that. I wasn't in charge of keeping the evidence, sir.

Q. Do I take that to mean that you don't know what happened to the seat?

A. I'm not the case coordinator, sir. I'm testifying on what I did in that case and not what someone else did.

Q. I don't mean to drag this out. Do you know what happened to the seat?

A. Not without looking at the case and you know reviewing what went on. I'm sure at one time I knew, but this was back in 1997 and this was many, many homicides back.

Q. Let me get back to the interview y'all had with Mr. Rimmer. He's seated at the end of the table and you're explaining the seating arrangement. Who was it that interviewed him? Was all of y'all asking questions, or was one person in charge of this interview?

A. I wouldn't say anyone was really in charge of the interview. Sergeant Wilkinson asked him questions and I asked questions, also.

group? Was anybody taking notes? Did you write those 2 questions down? Did you write your answers down? 3 That's what this is, sir. Did you do that at the time it was being done, the Ο, 5 interview was being done, or is that a summary of this 6 interview after the interview was over? 7 I hand wrote little notes to refresh my memory and Α. 8 when I got back here to Memphis and had access to my computer, I reduced those notes to this supplement, sir. 10 So when did you get back to Memphis and prepare 11 that report? 12 I can't recall what day we flew back to Memphis, Α. 13 but shortly after I got back to Memphis, I put this on paper. 14 Several days after the interview? 0. 15 What's your definition of "several days", sir? 16 Well, I don't know what definition to use. I'm 17 just trying to establish --18 THE COURT: Hold on, just a minute now. You're 19 using a term "several days". This witness is asking you, 20 what is your understanding of "several days", and you're 21 walking away from him. Please? 22 MR. GARRETT: Two days. 23 THE COURT: There you go, thank you. 24 Two to three days, would be fair. Α. 25

Q.

1

Well, did anybody serve as a secretary of this

MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

Q. What happened to those notes that you took during the interview?

- A. After this is typed up I don't keep those notes any longer, they're destroyed.
- Q. Is that department policy, too, that you destroyed your notes once you write up your report?
- A. I don't have any place to store notes. And if you had that note in front of you, it wouldn't mean anything to you, because I write just things to refresh my memory. And I have no place to store it, so this is it. This is the culmination of those notes.
- Q. I believe that your testimony was that Mr. Rimmer said -- what did Mr. Rimmer say about Ms. Ricci? About her body, something of that nature?
- A. I don't know what you're asking me, sir.
- Q. What was Mr. Rimmer's response when you told him that she was missing?
- A. Okay. According to my supplement here, Sergeant Wilkinson told Michael Rimmer that Ricci was missing. Michael Rimmer tried to make light of what was said by telling the investigators that Ricci probably went home to her mother's home in Alabama. Michael Rimmer continued to deny any knowledge of Ricci's whereabouts. Sergeant

Wilkinson told Michael Rimmer that we feel that Ricci is dead. Michael told the investigators that Ricci cannot be dead because they do not have the body.

- Q. Why do you say in your report that, "he tried to make light", by saying that she went home to Alabama? What does that mean?
- A. Just what I said in my report, "he made light of it". Like there was nothing to it.
- Q. Did you find him saying that she went home to Alabama, as that being unusual, there's something strange about that?
- A. In looking at the investigation, yes, I would think so, because we feel that he's responsible for this homicide and he's just making light, "Oh, she's just gone home to Alabama".
- Q. But, that's because you think he's responsible for it, that you say today, that that's making light of this?
- A. I'm in Franklin, Indiana interviewing him, because we have a feeling that he is involved in this, yes, sir.
- Q. I see. And your further comment was -THE COURT: Could counsel approach the bench?

THE COURT: Could counsel approach the bench? I apologize, but I've got to talk to you.

(A bench conference was held on the record in the presence of the jury, but out of it's hearing and the following proceedings were

had, to-wit:)

THE COURT: One of our jurors needs a recess.

(Said bench conference having been completed,
the following proceedings were had in the presence
of the jury:)

THE COURT: We'll give y'all just a short break.

Don't discuss the case amongst yourselves, or allow anyone to discuss it with you.

(A recess was had, after which time the following proceedings were had in the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: The defendant's present. Witness resume the stand.

(Witness complied).

Do you remember where you were?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. You may continue, sir.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Continued Cross-examination):

- Q. Sergeant Ashton, I think just before we left I was asking you about a comment that Mr. Rimmer allegedly made regarding Ricci not being dead because you didn't have a body, or words to that affect; is that correct?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. What was the date of that statement?

A. This was Thursday, March the 6th, 1997.

Q. And how long had Ms. Ricci been missing?

A. I don't recall off the top of my head. That's contained in the state's case there.

Q. Does February the 7th, or February the 8th sound about right?

A. Sir, without reviewing the case, I couldn't give you a specific date on that.

Q. You know that it was several weeks, though, don't you?

A. To the best of my recollection it was.

Q. You knew that there had been newspaper articles, after newspaper articles, regarding her disappearance; didn't you?

A. I'm not familiar with how many articles, no, sir.

Q. Did you check to see whether the articles were saying that they were looking for her, she disappeared and they didn't know where the body was, or they didn't know where she was?

A. I don't normally read the newspaper, sir, so I couldn't say.

Q. Would it surprise you, though, that that had been published in the papers every day, or every few days; would it?

MR. HENDERSON: Objection, Your Honor. Whether or

not he's surprised, or not, is totally irrelevant to this jury.

MR. GARRETT: I'll withdraw the question.

THE COURT: Thank you. You can't consider the question, can't even give an answer. Go ahead.

- Q. You don't know what was said in the media about this case between the time that this incident actually happened and the time that you interviewed Mr. Rimmer; do you?
- A. Sir, let me explain. I was not the case coordinator on this. The job of a case coordinator is to have other investigators, such as myself, working for him. And him give me an assignment to go do a specific thing. I go and do that one thing. I'm not the keeper of the record in the case. I don't know every aspect of the case. That's the job of the case coordinator. And along with working with this, I may be working on four, or five other cases at the same time. And so for me to be able to keep up with every aspect of this case, I wouldn't be able to do that, because I am not the case coordinator, sir.
- Q. Sergeant Ashton, aren't you telling the jury that Mr. Rimmer said that, "She can't be dead, because you don't have a body", because you want them to believe that he knew something that he wasn't suppose to know? Wasn't that the reason for that.

MR. HENDERSON: Objection, Your Honor. The reason he said that is, because he was asked the question. If he wants to ask me questions, you better believe, I'll get on the stand. It's not up to this officer to decide whether or not to answer the questions.

THE COURT: Is that an objection?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond, sir?

MR. GARRETT: No, sir, I'll move on, sir.

THE COURT: Can't consider any of that.

Q. Sergeant Ashton, you indicated that Mr. Rimmer, when asked about his leaving Memphis said it was his nature to get up and leave like that; is that correct?

A. Let me review this and see how he said that.

(A brief pause was had in the proceedings).

On the second page of my supplement the investigators asked Michael Rimmer, why he left town, suddenly. Michael Rimmer told the investigators that it was his nature to just get up and leave. Michael Rimmer told the investigators that he had just been in Memphis, too long.

- Q. Do you know, Sergeant Ashton, how long Michael Rimmer had been out of prison?
- A. I can't give you a specific time, but it seems like it had probably been a couple of months, or several months.
- Q. Do you know how long he had been in prison?

A. I don't have that information in front of me, but I believe I heard that he was there for, like, eight or ten years.

- Q. Did you check to see whether he was correct when he said that it was his nature to get up and leave like that?

 That he wants to travel.
- A. Who would I ask that? Michael Rimmer was the one who told me. Who better than him would know that?
- Q. Did you try to find out from any other source as to whether he had been traveling before, been leaving Memphis on the spur of the moment, before? Had been out of state before? Did you check on that, at all?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. So it may have been his nature to get up and leave like that; right?
- A. Well, I thought it was strange, because during the investigation I went to the last place that he was employed, as a body repair person. And he left in such a hurry that he left all of his tools. And it's been my understanding, having worked around mechanics before, in previous jobs, that those tools are precious. You don't even want to lend them somebody. But, he got up and left and didn't even take his tools. Didn't tell his employer that he wasn't coming back.

I went down to his sister's house, the room that he was occupying down there, his clothing and stuff was in a

)

nice folded pile beside the bed. So yes, I thought that was kind of strange.

- Q. Did you check to see what kind of a relationship did he have with his employer? How long he had worked there?
- A. I remember speaking to the employer. I don't recall off of the top of my head how long he had been employed there. But, the employer indicated that he was a good employee.
- Q. Did you check his attendance record with that employer to see whether he had missed time before from work?
- A. I'm sure that came out in our conversation, but off the top of my head, I can't recall what he said.
- Q. So you don't know that he hadn't on previous occasions got up and left and came back to that same job; do you?
- A. The employer did not indicate that, no, sir.
- Q. Did you ask him?
- A. I didn't ask him that specific question.
- Q. Any reason for you to believe that however long Mr. Rimmer was gone that he could have come back to that employer and get his tools?
- A. I don't follow your question?
- Q. You told this jury that on the second day of this interview that he acted, what was the term that you used?

 How did you describe Mr. Rimmer's conduct?

Q.

- A. I don't know the word I used in the record, sir.
- Q. Could you tell us how he acted the second interview?
- A. Yes, sir. From my supplement, dated 3-07-97, Friday, at 09:30 hours. Sergeants Ashton and Wilkinson began the interview with Michael Rimmer. Michael Rimmer was very hostile towards the investigators. Michael Rimmer told the investigators that he spoke with his father and learned that his sister was being committed to Lakeside Hospital, because we were investigating him. Michael Rimmer took issue with the investigators for interviewing his brother, Richard Rimmer on this case. Michael told the investigators that his father told him not to talk to the police, because they were, "fucking liars".
- Memphis, during the time that he had been gone; right?

 A. I don't know, sir. He indicated in this statement that he had spoken to people back in Memphis the night.

So Mr. Rimmer had been in touch with people in

- Q. So based on those conversations he could have known about the news reports regarding Ms. Ricci's disappearance?
- A. I can't testify on what he might have known, sir.
- Q. Weren't y'all there accusing Mr. Rimmer of murder or having something to do with this lady's disappearance?
- A. We were investigating the homicide and

previous, on that Thursday night.

disappearance of Ricci Ellsworth; yes, sir.

- Q. Did you tell him that you thought had had something to do with it, or that he knew something about it?
- A. I believe with our appearance there and asking him about the case, there was a pretty good indication of that.
- Q. Did it strike you as strange that he would act agitated when he is being accused of murder?
- A. He didn't act agitated on Thursday, after being accused. He tried to act in amazement. The next day, after he had spoken with his father at home, that is when he was agitated and hostile towards us.
- Q. Do you know for a fact that it was that evening in between those two interviews that he spoke to his father?
- A. I wasn't with him, I don't know when he spoke to his father, sir.
- Q. Well, didn't you just say, "the next day after he had spoken to his father at home", wasn't that your statement?
- A. That's what he indicated, you know, in here when he said that his father told him not to talk to the police.
- Q. Did he say when he had talked to his father?
- A. I don't have that written down here.
- Q. Throughout this entire interview process Mr. Rimmer denied any knowledge of any involvement in this incident that resulted in Ms. Ricci's disappearance and any knowledge of

it; didn't he?

Yes, sir, he did. Α.

Thank you. Q,

THE COURT: Any redirect?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. JONES:

Sergeant Ashton, you testified that you're not the keeper of the record in this case, but you made an accurate record of this interview?

I made an accurate record of everything that I did in this case. If I, like in this, I did this interview and I made a record of that. When I went and talked to his employer, I made a record of that. Everything that I did I made records of it and then that is given to the case coordinator who has other investigators working for him. He takes all this together, he compiles it, he keeps it, he's the keeper of the record. He's the one that knows everything that's going on about this case. I only know the stuff that's happening that I have a part in this case. Because, like I said earlier, I'll be working on several other cases at the same time that I'm working on this. And I'll also have my own case that I'll be working.

- On March 6th of 1997 and March 7th of 1997, you ο. were present during the entire interview session?
- Yes, ma'am. Α.

Page 665

1

2

3

4

5

6

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. 1 Yes, ma'am, I did. Α. 2 Do you bring those notes back to Memphis? Q, 3 Yes and they are reduced to this supplement right here, yes, ma'am. 5 So that supplement that you've been reading from is Q. 6 a record of that interview? 7 Yes, ma'am, it is. Α. 8 And you made that record pursuant to the time that Ο. your interviewed occurred? 10 Yes, ma'am. Α. 11 From your handwritten notes that you took during 0. 12 the interview? 13 Yes, ma'am. Α. 14 And you put them on the computer close to the time Q. 15 that you returned to Memphis? Yes, ma'am. Α. 17 Now, during this interview you were there to get a 18 statement from the defendant to find out what he had to say; 19 is that why you were there? 20 I would have loved to have gotten a statement from Α, 21 him, if he would have given us a statement, but he refused to 22 give a written statement to us. 23 Now, according to your notes on the March 6th, 1997 Q. 24 interview, what day was the interview? 25

Did you take notes during the entire session?

1	Α.	March the 6th of 1997, according to my supplement					
2	was a Thursday.						
3	Q.	And anywhere, from your notes on that date, did					
4	Michael R	immer indicate to you that he had spoken with his					
5	father on	that day?					
6	Α.	No, ma'am.					
7	Q.	March the 7th of 1997, what day of the week is					
8	that?						
9	Α.	According to my supplement, that would have been a					
10	Friday.						
11	· Q .	So he indicated on that day that he had spoken with					
12	his father?						
13	Α.	Yes, ma'am.					
14	Q.	Now, what day did he tell you that Ricci cannot be					
15	dead, because they do not have a body? Was that that Friday						
16	or was that that Thursday?						
17	Α.	That was on Thursday.					
18		MS. JONES: I have nothing further.					
19		THE COURT: Any recross?					
20		MR. GARRETT: One moment, Your Honor.					
21		(A brief pause was had in the proceedings).					
22		No further questions, Judge.					
23		THE COURT: Thank you, sir, you may step down.					
24	You're fre	ee to go about your business.					
25		(Witness excused).					

		Call your next witness.					
1 2		MR. HENDERSON: I'd call Lieutenant Shemwell.					
3		ROBERT SHEMWELL was called, sworn, examined and					
4	testified	as follows:					
5	DIRECT EX	AMINATION					
6	BY MR. HE	NDERSON:					
7	Q,	Would you tell us your full name, please?					
8	Α.	Lieutenant Robert Shemwell.					
9	Q.	You're obviously employed by the Memphis Police					
10	Departmen	t; is that correct?					
11	Α.	That's correct.					
12	Q.	And how long have you been with the Memphis Police					
13	Departmen	Department, all together?					
14		THE COURT: Give us the spelling of that last name?					
15	Q.	Spell that last name for us?					
16	Α.	S-H-E-M-W-E-L-L.					
17	Q.	How long have you been with the Memphis Police					
18	Department?						
19	Α.	Twenty years in July.					
20	Q.	Where are you assigned right now?					
21	Α,	West precinct, Charlie shift.					
22	Q,	What's a "Charlie shift"?					
23	Α.	2:00 in the evening until 10:00 at night.					
24	Q.	Did you work 2:00 to 10:00 last night?					
	۱۸	Von din I notually I worked a little later than					

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that.

- How long have you been a Lieutenant with the Q. Memphis Police Department?
- Since May 23 of 2002.
- And back in February of 1997 where were you working with the Memphis Police Department?
- Homicide. Α.
- 0. How long were you in homicide before you were promoted to Lieutenant?
- Α. Almost seven years.
- Now, specifically on February the 8th of 1997 in the early hours, were you called to the scene out at the Memphis Inn, in Memphis, Tennessee?
- Yes, sir. Α,
- That is located here in Memphis, Shelby County, Q. Tennessee; is that correct?
- That's correct, it is.
- Would you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what you found when you got there?
- Yes. When I arrived I was met by night detectives. Α. Dana Stines, Sergeant, who had previously made the scene and determined that we needed to be called out. I was on the homicide call out team. Myself and Sergeant O. W. Stewart. I lived not to far from that location, so I made it pretty quick. I was there, probably, twenty or twenty-five minutes

Page 669

after the call. It was the early morning hours, raining. When I arrived I spoke with Detective Stines, as well as the crime scene officer, Captain Moore, was already there. And they started pointing out evidence to me that was on the sidewalk outside.

Right when you come in, where the Memphis Inn is located, the front actually faces Macon Cove, however, the night entrance is on the west side and that's where the parking lot is. And just outside the night entrance door was Ms. Ellsworth's vehicle and immediately to the right of it on the sidewalk there was blood droplets leading back into the night entrance area, on the kick plate of the night entrance area, going onto the carpet. You walk into a little lobby area, there's a bath room to your left, vending machines in front of you and to your right, you turn to your right there is a door that leads into the office area itself. It has a key pad lock on it that's supposed to be secured at night.

Just to the left of that is a window that the clerk can work out of and it has a little slide under there where you can do money transactions and key transactions there.

On the door, or jam of the door plate and on the key pad lock, there was blood. It appeared that it was running down the frame there at the door, going into the lobby area. There was blood in and around the counter top

area on some documentations, some paperwork that were on the counter, as well as a clip board.

Behind the cash register, work area, there was blood back there and it led back into an office area in the back. We got back there and there was blood there, as well. There was a close hanger that was right at the door way that had one of the white paper linings on it and there was blood. droplets, I remember, being there.

There was a ring that was there on the floor leading into the bath room area that's off of that office area there in the back. And when we got back there, that's where the majority of the blood was.

- And did you become the case officer for that case, Q, that particular night?
- It was early morning. It was about 5:20 something when I got the call. I got there just before 6:00 o'clock. What we do in homicide, I'm on the call out team. Houston, at that time, was the one that placed the call to me. He was supervising that day. I was notified, I guess, half-way into that morning that I was going to be actually assigned as case officer, since I had most knowledge of what was going on.
- At least that day, you became the case coordinator Q, as you call it; is that correct?
- Α. Yes, sir.

25

Page 671

2

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

- Q. For the sake of the jury, is a case coordinator, does that mean, like on TV, that you do everything in the case?
- A. No. The case coordinator with homicide, the way we work it is, the case coordinator, at times -- and it is best that you go to the scene, but there's a lot of times that you don't. You are responsible for all information regarding that case, compiling all of the information and all the evidence, viewing everything regarding that particular case, making decisions in what direction to go and who to talk to and after the information is all gathered, you're the one that's responsible to talk to the Attorney General and present the case for them to determine the charges.
- Q. Does that mean that the case coordinator always go out and interview every single witness then?
- A. No. No very seldom does the case coordinator, especially in a case involving this many people, it's not feasible to do that. We work as a team in homicide. And what a case officer does is, he assigns duties to other investigators and usually it's two officers at one time. That way, you always have someone there who's taking the notes and the other one interviewing them. And sometimes when you're doing the talking you might miss something that someone else is saying. Therefore, the other person is there to ask that question.

Q. And if you are the case coordinator, are you the case coordinator in every case then?

- A. No.
- Q. You might be the case coordinator in this case and at the same time working for another one of the detectives who is a case coordinator in another case; is that right?
- A. In homicide, that happens daily.
- Q. So you don't just do one homicide at a time, like on TV?
- A. No. But, on this particular case, it's a very long, drawn-out case and we dedicated a lot of time on this one.
- Q. While you were working on this case, did you get any other homicides to work?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And the people that you were supervising also got other homicides to work, too?
- A. That is correct.
- Q. All right. Let's go back to this particular crime scene. Was anything done to see whether or not anybody in the rooms there at the hotel did anything?
- A. Yes. There at the time when I arrived the officers were already questioning anyone that was there, that was attempting to leave, check out. We actually set up in the office, I think, as a vacant room next door for those

____)

transactions to find out who was there. Of course, we had all of the cards of everyone that was supposed to be there, with their information, driver's license, or any information that the desk clerk took that night, or the previous night.

Also, when Sergeant Stewart got there he began a room to room search to find out if anyone had checked in during this time and who was there and if anybody had seen, or heard anything at all during the night.

- Q. Did you tell the crime scene what evidence you wanted collected and what you wanted them to do when you were at the scene?
- A. Yes. They had actually already started processing the scene, prior to me arriving. Nothing was actually collected until we get there and everything is on halt, other than them photographing everything. And they basically were the ones who were pointing out evidence to me as we were going from room to room. But, they were the ones who were actually collecting evidence.
- Q. While you were out there was the victim's husband, Mr. Donnie Ellsworth, did he arrive out there at the scene?
- A. He had arrived and left with a night investigator, prior to my arrival. And I was informed that he was there and was cooperating with the night detectives and that they were going to his residence to retrieve some possible information and provide assistance in the investigation.

Q. So by the time you got there he was already helping the officers try to locate a suspect?

A. Yes.

- Q. Did you get the name of that suspect from any other officers that they presented to be the source?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And what was the name of that suspect?
- A. Michael Rimmer.
- Q. In the course of the investigation did you take steps to have people look for Mr. Michael Rimmer?
- A. Immediately.
- Q. Did you take steps to have people look for Ricci Ellsworth, dead, or alive?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And over a period of months there, what kind of efforts did you all take in order to try to locate Ricci Ellsworth, dead or alive?
- A. That night, or that afternoon that the information was compiled. I was at the hotel for quite a long time. It was such a bad scene. I documented it. It was my job, I was the scene investigator. I had to document everything. When I got back I briefed my supervisors and it was at that time it took us a little while to obtain photographs of Ricci that we could release to the media with information, if anybody had any information regarding the incident, itself,

or the whereabouts of Ricci Ellsworth. That was released to the newspaper, all the TV stations. Flyers were distributed by the family of Ricci Ellsworth. Of course, all the information was given out to all uniformed patrol officers in the county.

- Q. Did you take steps to notify law enforcement agencies in other jurisdictions that you were looking for Ricci Ellsworth?
- A. Yes, we entered an N. C. I. C.
- Q. What is "N. C. I. C."?
- A. It's National Crime Information Center, a network, it's a national computer system that we set up through the F. B. I. You put information into whatever you're looking for, into it, and requested that if anybody comes in contact with a certain individual, or whatever you're looking for, to notify this police department, immediately. And we have to respond immediately and that's handled through our dispatcher's office.
- Q. So if Ricci had picked up a traffic ticket in San Diego, California next week and they check the N. C. I. C., they would have known to notify you all; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Now the suspect, Michael Rimmer, was his name put on the N. C. I. C.?
- A. Eventually, with the vehicle information that we

had that he was possibly in possession of.

Q. And did you get some information concerning what the description of the vehicle was that he might be operating?

- A. Yes, we did.
- Q. And that went into the N. C. I. C. as well?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Prior to Mr. Rimmer's arrest did you get any leads to check out, as detective in this case?
- A. Numerous leads.
- Q. Could you give us any estimates, or a ball park figure, how many leads y'all tried to track down?
- A. We had a composite drawing obtained from an individual who was there that night and saw a man behind the check out counter, which we knew was not supposed to be there. We distributed that flyer and after that was distributed in the newspaper and the media, we started receiving calls from anybody that looked like him. And we did our best to attempt to locate any photographs, arrest histories of those individuals, whether they were local, or out of town. We would notify those police departments, or penal facilities, or anything, to locate photographs to put in a photo spread. And I think that I accumulated something like, I want to say, fifty-something photographs, a total of different people.

Δ

Q. Did you get any tips, or leads on where Ricci Ellsworth might be, either dead, or alive?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And did y'all check those out?
- A. That's correct. We had one information from a lady that thought she might had seen her alive several days after the incident, in a certain area. I notified that particular precinct and distributed photographs of her, again, and the information. As well as, we received several people that called in to give us information where she might be buried.
- Q. Did you ever get any calls from psychics to tell you where she was?
- A. I did get calls from people that called to ask if we needed their assistance. I don't recall talking to any of these individuals, at any length, or period.
- Q. You didn't consult a psychic, I take it?
- A. No.
- Q. Did you conduct searches of some property belonging to, or at least, occupied by Mr. Rimmer's brother down in Mississippi?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Did you coordinate the other people to do the interview, or go down there yourself?
- A. I went down there myself, along with search and rescue units from Shelby County, as well as Desoto County.

Page 679

Q. And do you know what happened to that car after they got through searching it?

A. Yes, we wrapped it up in a hundred foot tarp, loaded it on a flat bed and it was brought down to Memphis. Sergeant Helldorfer, the vehicle was released to him, at our crime scene office.

Q. Now, did you interview the defendant up there in Franklin, Indiana?

A. I didn't personally, I had Sergeant Wilkinson and Sergeant Ashton talk to him.

Q. Did you also pick up personal property of the defendant's from the Johnson County Sheriff's Department?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And sent those items to the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation; is that correct?

A. Some of them, that's correct.

Q. Did you at some point get access to a letter that a Mr. Conaley had written to the T. B. I.?

A. Yes.

Q. And as a result of getting that letter, what did you do?

A. Instructed two investigators to go to the prison to talk to Mr. Conaley.

Q. And did they report to you after they interviewed this witness?

- A. That's correct. I want to say that they took a handwritten statement from him, because he was actually in the facility.
- Q. Were you also present when Ms. Marjorie Floyd, the mother of the victim in this case, had a blood sample drew, for the purposes of DNA?
- A. Yes. I arranged that meeting with our sexual resource center and actually transported her down there.
- Q. And when the dried sample was prepared, it was turned over to you, sealed?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. What did you do with it?
- A. I tagged it in our property room and then checked it back out and when it was time to send it to the lab to be tested against other items that we had.
- Q. The paper documents that you got from the defendant's car, the car that he was operating up there, did you get hotel receipts, pawn tickets and that sort of thing out of the car?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Did they have locations on them?
- A. Yes, they did.
- Q. Did you try to figure out where those locations were and what the dates were?
- A. It was pretty easy. He kept up with just about

every where that he went. Had the dates, especially on the hotel receipts of when he checked in and when he checked out. How many were in the room. The vehicle he was driving. You could tell which hotel that he gave the information, I guess, which hotel that they verified the information, because it was not correct at all times, but it was similar.

- Q. What type of car did he indicate he was operating during this time?
- A. A Honda Accord.
- Q. The same one that y'all found him in up in Indiana?
- A. That's correct. And he used the same tag number several times.
- Q. The same tag number was on the car when he was arrested?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Did you ever sit down and look at a map and try to figure out where he went and when he went there?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. I'll hand you this item and ask you to take a look at it.

(Document tendered to witness).

Does that map indicate the dates and places where you were able to verify, or where the records indicated that the defendant was on those dates?

A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.

Page 682

in Franklin, Indiana.

Q. And what were the dates? If I could, before I show this, could you just explain to us, starting with the first date on there, the path taken, according to the records found in the defendant's car?

A. Okay. On 2/8/97, which was the actual date of occurrence -- and if I'm not mistaken, the actual time of this is in Myrtle, Mississippi, but the actual time was later on that evening, it's dated 2/8/97.

The next is dated next down in -- I'm going to spell the name of this city -- it's M-I-C-A-N-O-P-Y, Florida.

Q. Micanopy?

A. Right. And that's the way I'm pronouncing it. And it's on 2/13/97. And he went trailing back up northwest to Greenvalley, Missouri, 2/15/97. And to Casper, Wyoming, 2/17/97. And to Mesoula, Montana — there's two dates there, 2/17/97 and 2/18/97. Then he went southwest into Vacaville, California, 2/25/97. And to San Francisco, California, 2/26/97. And then he went along the Mexican border to Blythe, California, 2/28/97. And he went back east to Casa Grande, Arizona, 3/1/97. And 3/3/97 he's in Bernando, Texas. And then he went back northeast, 3/5/97 where he was arrested

Q. And Mesoula, Montana, that's in two different motels he stayed in on two different nights; is that right?

A. That's correct.

23

24

25

MR. HENDERSON: Your Honor, I'd ask that be marked as state's exhibit number thirty-one.

MR. GARRETT: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mark it as exhibit number thirty-one into evidence, testimony of Lieutenant Shemwell.

(Exhibit number thirty-one was marked and filed for record as evidence.)

MR. HENDERSON: With the Court's permission, may I publish this to the jury on the overhead?

THE COURT: Yeah.

- Q. Again, this is not for design to show highways, it's not a straight highway between these points; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. And the time scale, for instance, from Mesoula,
 Montana, last date was February the 18th and the next date is
 February the 25th in California; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. So we just don't have any records to indicate where he was between those two; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. We're not trying to say that he took a week to travel that far; are we?
- A. No.

MR. HENDERSON: No further questions of this

witness, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may cross-examine.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. GARRETT:

- Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, my name is Coleman Garrett and I need to ask you a few questions about your testimony and your involvement in this case. Was it your testimony that you all developed numerous suspects during the investigation of this disappearance of Ms. Ricci?
- A. There were leads, yes, sir.
- Q. Numerous leads. And as a part of those leads, I believe you said something about a composite drawing. Where did you get that lead from?
- A. From an individual who attempted to check in that morning.
- Q. Do you remember that individual's name?
- A. James -- I remember him being a military man. He is extremely tall. I want to say he was stationed in Hawaii and he had to be at home on leave. I cannot recall his last name.
- Q. Does Darnell sound correct?
- A. That's correct, James Darnell.
- Q. When did you talk to James Darnell?
- A. He called one night about -- I want to say it was 10:00 o'clock, or a little after 10:00 o'clock, we was about

Page 685

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

5

6

7

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

to leave from work that night. And I want to say it was -this happened on the 8th -- I want to say it was a couple of
days later, maybe on the 10th, or 11th. And he was about to
leave to go back to Hawaii.

- Q. Did you talk to Mr. Darnell, directly?
- A. No, I did not. Sergeant's Bodding and Sergeant Wilkinson talked to him.
- Q. Did you at any point talk to James Darnell during the investigation of this case?
- A. On the telephone.
- Q. What lead did you get from James Darnell?

MR. HENDERSON: Object, Your Honor, to the relevance. At this point he has already established that he had various leads. If he's going to ask for a hearsay, I object to hearsay.

THE COURT: Come on up.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was had on the record in the presence of the jury, but out of its hearing and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: All right. We have an objection.

MR. SPRINGER: Yes, Your Honor. James Darnell is an individual who was the only eye witness that we saw from the list of witnesses that the officers testified. And he stated that he's also the only individual who described the bloody knuckles of the one who was behind the counter, the

one who was handling money. It goes directly to our residual doubt proof that the defense wants to put on. So I think that it's extremely relevant here. And I think, quite frankly, as State versus Teague lays out, the rules of evidence do not apply so long as the other side has the opportunity to rebut any evidence that goes to the circumstances of the residual doubt evidence.

MR. HENDERSON: First off, the case doesn't say that the rules of evidence don't apply to sentencing hearing.

THE COURT: But they do.

MR. HENDERSON: They are relaxed. And this is hearsay. And I'd say, I've tried to locate this witness and

MR. HENDERSON: They are relaxed. And this is hearsay. And I'd say, I've tried to locate this witness and haven't been able to get him. I don't think we have any basis for being up here, whatsoever. It doesn't just mean that you no longer have to call witnesses, or subpoena witnesses to lay foundations. It's more relaxed.

MR. SPRINGER: Your Honor, if I could respectfully request that we excuse the jury and to have a jury out hearing on this matter.

THE COURT: Yeah, we'll do that.

(Said bench conference having been completed, the following proceedings were had in the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: I have a matter that I have to attend to that's none of your business, yet. So you can step out of

Page 687

the courtroom. Don't discuss the case among yourselves, or allow anyone to discuss it with you.

(Whereupon, the jury retired from open court and the following proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: All right. The jury is not present.

Let's take it from the objection on the record, so that we get a good clean record. The objection is, state?

MR. HENDERSON: The objection is he's attempting to introduce a hearsay statement of a witness who is not here, so that's substantive proof.

THE COURT: Response?

MR. SPRINGER: Your Honor, it's our position that this is a sentencing hearing and as outlined under the case law and the statute for the purpose of sentencing hearing --

THE COURT: And you cited a case?

MR, SPRINGER: At State versus Teague, Your Honor. The cite is 897 SW2nd, 248. It's a 1995 case, I believe, Your Honor. And my understanding, as I read Teague, and I will state that language that I think is pertinent here, Your Honor.

"In the sentencing proceeding evidence may be presented as to any matter that the Court deems relevant to the punishment, that may include, but is not limited in nature of the circumstances of the crime. The defendant's character, background history, physical condition, any

evidence tending to establish or rebut the aggravated circumstances enumerated in subsection (i), below, and any evidence tending to establish, or rebut any mitigating factors. Any such evidence which the Court deems to have probative value on the issue of punishment, may be received, regardless of it's admissibility under the rules of evidence, provided that the defendant --"

Because in this case the state was attempting to introduce it as evidence.

-- "is accorded a fair opportunity to rebut any hearsay statements so admitted".

So I would contend that State versus Teague stands with the proposition that hearsay evidence is admissible, so long as the state is given the opportunity to rebut any hearsay statements that may be introduced, pursuant to Lieutenant Shemwell's testimony.

THE COURT: And you're indicated that this witness that you're referring to would have done what?

MR. SPRINGER: This particular witness, Your Honor, as based upon the records, as we have reviewed them, is the sole eye witness that was listed on the investigation. And he stated, based upon his discussions with the police officers that he saw two individuals, both with blood on their knuckles. One who was handing money to another individual through a door, or window of some sort. And that

these individuals were there at around the same time that this crime was supposed to have been committed.

I think it goes directly to residual proof. And I think, quite frankly, it's extremely relevant. I would contend it goes directly to the heart, though, of the residual doubt proof.

Obviously, we're not here to discuss the guilt or innocence here, but I think residual doubt affords it. That the defendant has the right to put forth proof of actual innocence.

THE COURT: State?

MR. HENDERSON: May I suggest, rather than have counsel's statement, why don't we do an offer of proof and let him ask the questions of the officer, out of the hearing of the jury, so we really know what we're talking about. As opposed to just --

THE COURT: Yeah. Let's do that. Go ahead.

(CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GARRETT:)

- Q. Officer Shemwell, you indicated that you had contact with, or some of your investigators had contact with an individual by the name of James Darnell; is that correct?

 A. Correct.
- Q. What information, officer, did James Darnell provide to the police department?

MR. HENDERSON: I'm going to object to that, Your

2 3 4

 Honor, I think that it's one thing for him to testify what somebody told him, now he's going to testify to what he told somebody else, who told him. Surely there's some limit to this, before we get down to just rumor.

MR. GARRETT: This is just an offer of proof.

THE COURT: I think it was the form of your question.

MR. HENDERSON: He needs to differentiate what he knows personally and which he was told by other officers.

That might make it easier, is what I'm suggesting, Your Honor.

Q. What information do you have in your investigative reports regarding knowledge of James Darnell, in regards to this case?

THE COURT: Do you still have an objection?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, Your Honor. I mean, that's like, "Tell us what you did in this case". Read your whole supplement of every lead you've ever had.

- Q. Did Mr. Darnell provide the police department with any potential suspects in this case?
- A. A description of suspects, yes.
- Q. Would you tell us the descriptions that he provided you?
- A. If you're asking me height and weight, I cannot recall. But I can advise that he gave two composite drawings

of two individuals that he saw at the time that he went in to obtain a room that night.

- O. Do you remember what time he said that this was?
- A. I want to say, he said, around 2:15 in the morning.
- Q. Did he say where these individuals were, exactly, that he saw?
- A. Yes, sir. One was on the outside of the lobby area, where he was at. And the other was on the other side of the window, where the cashier would have been.
- Q. And when you say, "where the cashier would have been", did he mean where Ms. Ricci Ellsworth would have been working?
- A. Or any other employee would be.
- Q. And did he tell you what he observed these individuals doing?
- A. Yes, he advised that it appeared to him that the one on the inside was giving the one on the outside, that was in front of him, money and change. Dollar bills and change.
- Q. Did he describe anything unusual about these individuals?
- A. He believed that he saw blood from both of these individuals hands.
- Q. Did he say where he saw the blood on them?
- A. He described it as being around the knuckles.
- Q. Did the composite drawings that you made reference

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And you said that he gave you descriptions of these individuals?
- A. Of both individuals.
- Q. And can you tell us what he said in that regards?
- A. I can't recall. I believe he said that the individual on the inside was about five seven, or five eight, medium build, brown hair. And I want to say that he said that he was wearing what he thought to be blue-jeans, I want to say a black shirt, maybe. And maybe a blue jacket. The individual on the outside was wearing a tee-shirt and he believed, I think if I'm not mistaken, that he said was ripped, or torn around the shoulders. He had a strawberry blondish, long, kind of unkept hair.
- Q. Did he describe or tell you whether he was of the opinion, based on his observation, as to whether there had been an altercation in that area?
- A. Yes. He gave the opinion that he thought that these two individuals might have had a confrontation with each other. He said that he didn't notice any other injuries to the individuals, just that he thought that there was blood on both of these individuals hands. And he thought that they might have gotten into an altercation and that the male clerk

Page 693

was attempting to give the individual his money back over the room to make him leave.

- Q. So when he said, "male clerk", it was his opinion that the individual that was in this area where Ms. Ricci Ellsworth worked, was a clerk?
- A. In his opinion.
- Q. That was his opinion?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. To your knowledge, Officer Shemwell, or Lieutenant Shemwell, was Jim Darnell shown any photographs of any potential suspects in this case?
- A. I want to say that I shipped, or the F. B. I. sent photospreads that I had compiled. I want to say that there was something, like, fifty-something photographs, of individuals who were named and Michael Rimmer's picture was in that group of photographs.
- Q. Was James Darnell shown these photographs, or this group of photographs that included Mr. Rimmer's photograph?
- A. Yes, by the F. B. I. in Hawaii.
- Q. And Mr. Darnell identified Michael Rimmer as the individual -- one of the individuals that he observed on the evening that this incident took place, as he had told you about?
- A. He identified Michael Rimmer and another individual as someone that looked familiar to him. But, he did not

positively identify him as being the one that was behind, or in front of him at the hotel, no.

- Q. Is that identification information included in your investigative report any place?
- A. It should be. I believe it was sent back to us with a results from the F. B. I.
- Q. Do you have those reports here today?
- A. They should be in the file.
- Q. And could you refer to those reports, sir, and tell us, specifically, what Mr. Darnell said with respect to that identification of Mr. Rimmer?
- A. I didn't talk to Mr. Darnell, personally. I didn't talk to him but one time and that was on the phone, so.
- Q. That information would be contained in the investigative report, though; right?
- A. It should be.

MR. GARRETT: And Your Honor, I would request that the officer be given an opportunity to review his reports to see exactly what was said, regarding the identification of Mr. Rimmer?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. HENDERSON: Your Honor, it won't be in "his" report, because he didn't talk to the witness.

THE COURT: He's the case --

MR. HENDERSON: He would have to review the entire

investigative file, which is a banker's box.

THE COURT: No. He's indicating that he wants to know what part of that file the witness made identifications, or comments about his client. Is that correct, sir?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

MR. HENDERSON: I have no objection with him reviewing the file. I don't know where it is, either. But, the file is -- part of it's on the cart, and part of it's here and the rest of it is in a banker's box in the office.

THE COURT: But, you would know where that part is?

MR. HENDERSON: I don't, no.

THE COURT: He would. Is that right?

A. I'd have to go through the whole thing, Your Honor. There was a conversation with me and I think, Stumpy Roberson, Sergeant Roberson was the one that handled that, Your Honor, with the F. B. I. and sent it out there. They were all Fed-Ex'd out to this individual, an F. B. I. agent in Hawaii.

THE COURT: Why don't we do this, I'm going to look at the Austin case, again, just a moment and see how far they're going to let me go with this. Is that all right?

MR. HENDERSON: I'll keep my objection, also, Your Honor, even if the Court allows the testimony in, I'd object to the portion that is the absent witnesses opinion. That wouldn't even be relevant if he were on the witness stand.

It wouldn't be admissible even if he were on the witness stand, where he gives an opinion as to what he thought might have happened. I don't think that becomes admissible, just because it's hearsay.

THE COURT: While I tend to agree with your statement, I want to see what Austin says. And so you get to step down. Take a recess.

(Witness temporarily excused).

MR. HENDERSON: Does Your Honor want him to go ahead and look through the file, during this recess? And if so, I was going to suggest, why don't we break for lunch to do that, since it's going to take him a good bit of time. If the Court wanted to do that at this point, or if you want to wait, whichever?

THE COURT: I just need to look at Austin. Give me five minutes and I'll tell you what we're going to do. How is that?

MR. HENDERSON: I'll be right here.

THE COURT: Beginning now. Take a recess.

(Whereupon, a recess was had, after which time the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.)

MR. HENDERSON: Do we want the witness back up there, right now?

THE COURT: No. And the jury is not present.

Well, yeah, he does need to know what I'm going to have him look for.

(Witness resumed stand).

THE COURT: You're still under oath. Austin simply says that the trial Court erred by excluding mitigating evidence on the basis that it constituted hearsay. And then we go a little bit further. If relevant hearsay is admissible during the penalty phase of the resentencing hearing of a capital murder case, got to let it in.

However, I think it's important to the Court because I'm not clear -- I do remember this fellow -- I'm not clear as to what he said about the Rimmer photograph. It was sent to the witness in Hawaii. It was one of them?

A. Yes, via the F. B. I. All fifty-five of the photographs.

THE COURT: Whether it's a look a-like, or I saw him there, I don't recall. And I really need to know that. What I'm looking at is residual doubt proof, is to rebut aggravating circumstance that we've got. Since the state is using the felony murder aggravator, to-wit; robbery. And it could apply to show that the defendant didn't commit the robbery. Again, if it is allowed for anything, it would be that, nothing else.

But, I've got to know, before I rule -- and I'm going to send the jury to lunch until 2:00 o'clock. Let's

see how far we can get with it. And then, I'm going to need to know the answer to that, okay? You with me?

All right. We will leave the jury out for their lunch period right now and bring them back in at 2:00 o'clock, if we can get far enough on the Court's question.

Let's take a recess. You assist the lawyers. And Mr. Rimmer, you have your lunch.

(Whereupon, a recess was had, after which time the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. Now, where's your witness?

MR. HENDERSON: He's out in the hall. Your Honor.

THE COURT: He'll be able to tell us if he got what we were asking, so let's bring him in and put him on the witness stand.

(Witness resumed stand).

You're still under oath.

Okay. The jury's out and the defendant is present.

There was an area of investigation that Lieutenant Shemwell was going to look through their records to see. He's your witness, you take it from there.

EXAMINATION BY MR. HENDERSON:

- Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, at the recess we go down to my office and go through the entire case file?
- A. That's correct.

.

- Q. And we didn't find any supplements from Sergeant Roberson: did we?
- A. No. Or, from the F. B. I. regarding that.
- Q. And the F. B. I., as I recall you said, explain to me, again, how those documents got to Hawaii?
- A. Sergeant Roberson contacted the F. B. I., submitted that information, I believe, to Agent Eakin's here, locally. And she had already opened up a case file with the F. B. I. on the Federal level, in order to do the blood work and other DNA evidence that we had. And she sent it to the agents in Hawaii for them to follow up. The photospreads of everyone that we could find photos on that was mentioned in any crime stoppers, any informant information, or any body's name that came up in the investigation.
- Q. Sergeant, do you remember whether you ever got a written supplement containing the results of the photospread?
- A. No.
- Q. And we didn't find one either?
- A. No.

MR. HENDERSON: Nothing further, Your Honor. He never got any written report back from it and we don't have a written report back from it.

THE COURT: Yes, sir, Mr. Garrett?

MR. GARRETT: If Your Honor, please, that is not all of the records that we received to ascertain. I have a

supplement that sets out the information provided to the police department during this investigation that was provided by the eye witness, James Darnell, and we're requesting that Officer Shemwell provide copies of the supplements from his investigative files, regarding the information gathered from James Darnell.

MR. HENDERSON: Isn't that what we were just talking about.

A. I submitted everything that I have.

MR. HENDERSON: He's got the supplement. And for the record, I did go back and double check and it was furnished to his original counsel, along with all of the crime stoppers and false lead information. So it's been around since 1998, at least.

THE COURT: Furnished to the defense?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir. I keep a complete copy of everything that I've given to the defense. And Mr. Ron Johnson got it, along with all the other stuff.

THE COURT: Mr. Garrett?

MR. GARRETT: Judge, I don't quite understand counsel's position. We were appointed on this case to represent Mr. Rimmer in connection with this resentencing. We filed motions in connection with that appointment. We filed motions for exculpatory evidence. We got a response to those motions for exculpatory evidence and discovery motions

and what have you. I didn't know that I am held accountable for documents that the Prosecutor's Office provided to Ron Johnson.

Obviously, we endeavored to gather all of the documents that we can. But, we haven't been provided any of this information by the Prosecutor's Office, since we have been on this case.

Quite frankly, the information that I have, the little bit that I have, regarding this particular subject matter, that being that of Jim Darnell, came from the defendant himself. I found no such information in the copies that I got from Mr. Johnson's office, or Mr. Scholl's office or the Skahan's office. We haven't been provided with it.

Now, if I'm held accountable for something that the Prosecutor's Office provided to some other counsel on this matter, during some other trial proceeding, I didn't know that I was being held accountable. I didn't know that. I didn't understand that that's they way the rules were. That once you provide it to some counsel, at some stage, that that also covers your obligation to provide that information to present counsel. If it does, then fine, but I didn't understand that.

THE COURT: Did you request from the Public Defender's Office, Mr. Ron Johnson's file?

MR. GARRET: I requested the file from Mr. Johnson?

THE COURT: Did they provide it?

MR. GARRETT: The documents were provided, how complete they were --

THE COURT: Okay. Did you request through the Skahan's who handled the appeal, what they had?

MR. GARRETT: I got -- let me back up just a minute. We didn't request documents from Ron Johnson.

THE COURT: No, from the Public Defender's Office?

MR. GARRETT: I didn't request documents from the Public Defender's Office. I requested documents from Mr. Scholl. He was on this case before we were.

THE COURT: That's true. He was fired by your client.

MR. GARRETT: Right. Mr. Scholl had gathered documents from the P. D.'s Office and I went to Mr. Scholl's office and got everything that he had.

THE COURT: Where do you think that your client got it?

MR. GARRETT: From one of these counsels.

THE COURT: From Mr. Scholl.

MR. GARRETT: Yeah, that's my understanding.

THE COURT: He didn't share it with you? He, being Mr. Rimmer.

MR. GARRETT: Mr. Rimmer provided me with the little information that I do have, as it relates to this

particular witness.

THE COURT: But, has he provided you with everything that he has?

MR. GARRETT: I don't know.

THE COURT: That's something that you don't know?

MR. GARRETT: I have no way of knowing that.

THE COURT: I'm just putting this on the record, that's all. And he can't make his lawyer ineffective, so we've sat that off in the corner some where.

MR. HENDERSON: Your Honor, that's the only supplement that there is about Mr. Darnell. He thinks that there's a whole investigative file on it, there's not.

There's a two page, or a page and a half supplement on it.

MR. GARRETT: Well, the problem with that there is that the copy that I got has got a couple or three lines that are not legible. On the copy that I have.

THE COURT: See if Mr. Henderson has something.

MR. HENDERSON: Your Honor, if I thought that we were fighting over whether or not two lines were legible, we probably could have handled this some time ago.

THE COURT: Well, that's not the point. The Court has already told y'all that the limits that the Court is looking at with regard to ruling, because this whole thing may only apply to show that the defendant did, or did not commit a robbery.

Vague leads are not before the Court in this proceeding.

MR. GARRETT: Sir?

THE COURT: Vague leads are not properly before the Court in this proceeding. And that's why we took the recess to see if we could clear some of this up.

Now, have you been given --

MR. HENDERSON: There is one sentencing missing off the top of the second page, Your Honor.

THE COURT: A sentence is missing off what?

MR. HENDERSON: One line is missing at the top, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. One line. Now, does that improve the document that you were given by your client?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Does it make a difference?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. So where are we now?

MR. GARRETT: We are ready to proceed and I want to pass this to the witness and have him testify regarding the information that the police department was provided through the eye witness, James Darnell.

THE COURT: All right. Any objections before we proceed?

MR. HENDERSON: No, Your Honor, but the only thing

is, I would like to get a copy of that page for my file, because I'd like to keep this file complete, in case ten years from now I have to go back and do this, again.

THE COURT: We can do that. And then we'll be ready?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes. sir.

THE COURT: Okay. In the meantime let's take just a short recess. Mr. Rimmer step out and we'll proceed shortly.

(Whereupon, a recess was had, after which time the following proceedings were had in the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Mr. Garrett, you may proceed.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Your Honor.

CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. GARRETT:

- Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, did you tell the jury, sir, that sometime during the investigation of the incident involving Ms. Ricci Ellsworth's disappearance that there was an individual who was identified as an eye-witness?
- A. An eye-witness to the crime? No, I did not.
- Q. Did you identify an individual that was listed as an eye witness?
- A. An eye-witness to the crime? No, sir.
- Q. Did you identify an individual that was identified

in your records as an eye-witness?

A. You'll have to elaborate on that, because I don't know what you want me to say. An eye-witness to what? I don't recall me listing, or telling this jury that there was an eye-witness to the crime at all, no.

Q. Let me pass you a document, sir.

(Document tendered to the witness).

Look at that Lieutenant, and if you would, tell the jury what that is, please?

A. It's the incident report, is the heading. It list people as to the possible relationship to this crime, whether or not that individual's involved, or they might be a witness. And if they're a witness, a witness to what. What they might be a witness to, or suspect information.

- Q. And who prepared that report?
- A. I did.
- Q. Do you see a person listed on there by the name of Jim, or James Darnell?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And under relationship, next to his name, what does it say?
- A. It says, "witness/eye".
- Q. Does that mean the same thing as eye-witness?
- A. That's not what you asked me, Mr. Garrett. You asked me did I tell this jury if there was an eye-witness.

No, I did not.

- Q. I understand. Does that mean the same thing as eye-witness?
- A. It means that he was there and he saw something.

 That's correct.
- Q. Did you speak with James Darnell?
- A. By phone, yes.
- Q. To your knowledge did James Darnell come to your office or to the police station and give a statement regarding what he observed on the evening of February the 7th, or early morning hours of February the 8th, 1997?
- A. Yes, he did so, at my instructions.
- Q. Were you present when he came to your office?
- A. Yes. And I instructed Sergeants Bodding and Wilkinson to speak with him.
- Q. And was there an investigative report prepared covering the information that James Darnell provided to your office?
- A. There was a typed statement from James Darnell by those investigators.
- Q. And would that statement had been typed on, or about the time that James Darnell gave the department the information?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. And is that statement kept as a part of your

investigative file in this case?

A. Yes, sir. It was submitted with the rest of these statements.

Q. Let me pass you a document, sir. If I could have the first one back, please.

(Document tendered to witness).

MR. GARRETT: If Your Honor, please, I would like to have this document marked for identification purposes only.

THE COURT: Which document?

MR. GARRETT: The one that I'm passing to the witness.

THE COURT: Well, he's got to identify it, first.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Your just a little early in your request.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir. Thank you, Judge.

- Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, can you identify the document that you've just been handed, please?
- A. Yes, it's a supplement. It not a complete supplement that was written, part of it is missing. The top part of it.
- Q. But, can you identify that as a supplement to what, sir?
- A. Supplement to this case file, in regards to

different individuals that we talked to.

Q. And would that portion of the supplement be a document that's kept as part of the investigative records in this case?

- A. Yes. Or, actually, the complete. This is just a copy and like I said, it's missing the top part of it, it is not complete.
- Q. Does that document reflect the information that was provided to the police department by the eye-witness, James Darnell?
- A. It has 22:00 hours on this particular date and, again, I would have to guestimate what date that is, because it's not on the top part of the document. James Darnell called the office and identified himself as Jim Darnell and gave me his date of birth and social security number and home address, where his parents were staying and his phone number. And advised that he was stationed in the Army, stationed currently in Hawaii.
- Q. And how old is Mr. Darnell?
- A. At this time he's 32 years of age.
- Q. And he gave you his social security number and his home address as you've indicated and the fact that he was stationed in Hawaii at that time?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. What does it say after that, sir?

Page 710

THE COURT: Hold it. First of all you're going to ask me to have this marked for identification purposes, only?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And you're wanting him to read from this paper to the jury, something that is, number one, not marked for anything. Number two, if it's marked for identification purposes only, it's not available to the jury. Now, what do you want to do?

MR. GARRETT: I'd like to have that document marked as the next exhibit in this case.

THE COURT: For identification purposes only?

MR. GARRETT: No.

THE COURT: Evidence?

MR. GARRETT: Evidence.

THE COURT: State?

MR. HENDERSON: Objection, Your Honor, it's hearsay. It's also irrelevant, a great deal of it.

THE COURT: I don't know that, because I'm not looking at it.

Y'all step out just a minute. Don't get happy about y'all being back in the back.

(Whereupon, the jury retired from open court and the following proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: All right. Let's take a recess, let me look at this. Mr. Rimmer can step out and then I'll come

back in and see where we are.

MR. GARRETT: Your Honor, before we go off the record can I, just for Your Honor's benefit, so we can identify the portion of this that the defense is interested in?

THE COURT: I pretty well know. If it doesn't apply to that witness. Do you see what I'm saying?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir. I'm sorry, Judge.

THE COURT: See what I'm saying? That's the reason I'm looking. So we both understand each other. And I appreciate you bringing it up, because otherwise --

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Take a recess.

(Whereupon, a recess was had, after which time the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.)

the COURT: What was given to the Court when I began to read it, on the first page, the title at the top is handwritten, "Add to Dixie Roberts". Second paragraph from the bottom begins; "22:00 hours the writer received a call from a male white identifying himself as Jim Darnell, 32 years of age, D.O. B. 12-17-65. Social security number 414-94-2007. H.A. 7270 -- stationed in Hawaii"

This is the next paragraph; "Darnell advises that he and a female, Dixie Roberts; went to the motel on 2-8-97

Page 712

around 1:45 to 2:00 a.m. and pulled up out front of the side of the check-out glass in the office area, also with what appeared to be blood on his knuckles."

It makes no sense.

MR. SPRINGER: I believe, Your Honor, the problem with the documentation that you received is that the top two lines of that next page is absent.

THE COURT: Well now, if that's true and Mr. Henderson just said that he gave you the complete copy.

MR. GARRETT: Judge, I inadvertently passed the wrong copy up.

THE COURT: All right. We don't have the -- does this help you, Lieutenant?

A. Yes, sir, it does.

THE COURT: Well, pass this back, we've got the wrong copy. Pass that one up and let me look at it. How about that?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir. I'm sorry about that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's all right. We're all tired and we only have about five more days to go. Take a recess.

(Whereupon, a recess was had, after which time the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. Obviously, we all agree

some of this has got to be redacted if I let it in. This paper-writing at the top, "Add to Dixie Roberts", being the issues that are before the Court, begins at the second paragraph from the bottom, on the first page of it.

On the second page, as I'm looking at it, it ends after the last sentence, "Darnell advised that he would come to the homicide office in the morning and give a statement about what he observed". And then it's got a date of 12-13-97. And it says, "End of supplement".

I'm holding three pages, one of which doesn't apply to this, at all. Is that right?

MR. GARRETT: If Your Honor's talking about the first page, that's true.

THE COURT: It starts with; "Thursday, February the 13th, Dixie Lee Roberts came to the office -- ", see what I'm saying?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir, that applies to this, too.

THE COURT: It doesn't apply to Darnell.

MR. GARRETT: Dixie Roberts and Jim Darnell were together.

THE COURT: No, no. I've already ruled. I'm not going to do that. All of the vague leads that are before the Court will not be pursued. I have read what Dixie Roberts says and no where does she say anything about somebody being in the secure area with bloody knuckles. Tell me about it?

Go ahead.

MR. SPRINGER: Well, Your Honor, I don't know how, necessarily, as it pertains to Jim Darnell, but --

THE COURT: It doesn't.

MR. SPRINGER: I understand that. However, for the purposes of the rest of our cross-examination, Dixie Roberts, the evidence that they relied upon to get a description of the vehicle that they alleged was used to transport Ms. Ellsworth's body was gathered from Ms. Dixie Roberts. And she gave a statement, too. So I don't know if that would be necessarily a vague lead. Much of the evidence that they used --

THE COURT: What I'm saying, gentlemen, is, I'm dealing with one of these at a time. If I don't, my record isn't going to be worth reading.

MR. SPRINGER: Absolutely, Your Honor. And as it relates to James Darnell, the third page is not relevant at this point.

THE COURT: Thank you. The state has objected that it is hearsay and while I agree, because the state is using felony murder as an aggravator, to-wit; robbery, I'll let it in, as to Jim Darnell, after redaction.

Now, the redaction is going to have to be done now. So we will take a recess. Y'all can use the A. O. C.'s photo copier in there across the hall. And then we'll determine

whether or not it rises to the level of being introduced for I. D., or evidence, in the redacted form.

I'm returning all of these three papers to the defense and we will take a recess. Mr. Rimmer can step out. Lieutenant you can step down again.

(Whereupon, a recess was had, after which time the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Defendant's present. Witness resume the stand.

Have you got the redacted copy?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Pass that up. I need to see it just a minute.

(Document tendered to the Court).

All right. Does everybody agree? Let me hear it?

MR. HENDERSON: Well, without waiving my objection,
for what it's worth, I agree to it being --

THE COURT: No, I'm agreeing to the redaction.

Now, I'll take objections after the agreement.

MR. HENDERSON: All right. I agree to the redaction, yes.

THE COURT: Thank you. Now, objections? Hearsay and --

MR. HENDERSON: And I object to it being marked as

an exhibit to be given to the jury, because I think it unduly emphasizes a hearsay statement over the oral testimony of other witnesses.

If it's going to be introduced it ought to be read to the jury, but not given to them as an exhibit to take back to the jury room. Because then it overly emphasizes, by giving them that in writing, a hearsay statement, which give them words that these weren't witnesses who testified.

THE COURT: Well, and that's what Mr. Garrett was attempting to do when he was asking the witness a question. And it was the Court's involvement in the proceedings that he really couldn't do anything until we decided whether or not it was evidence or not. Or, whether or not it was for identification. Under a rule of identification it's allowable by consent of both sides, to read this and say, yes this is what he said. All right, defense?

MR. SPRINGER: Your Honor, we have no objection if the jury is not allowed to take it back. I think the witness will be sufficient for the jury to consider.

THE COURT: Yeah. There you go.

MR. SPRINGER: And give whatever weight to it.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Garrett, are you ready?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. We're going to mark it first, or do you want to just use it as you were attempting

Page 717

to do, which is --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

MR. GARRETT: I think we still have to mark it for identification purposes.

THE COURT: At least that makes it part of the technical record.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mark it for identification as exhibit number thirty-two. And that is a paper-writing of -- what's the witnesses name?

A. James Darnell.

THE COURT: Well, it will show up on the transcript if there's a need for appellate review, they'll find it.

(Exhibit number thirty-two was marked and filed for record as evidence.)

Anything else?

MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

THE COURT: Bring in the jury.

(Whereupon, the jury returned to open court and the following proceedings were had, to-wit:)

THE COURT: Mr. Garrett, you may proceed.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Your Honor.

Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, I believe you identified that supplemental report regarding the information that you got from the eye-witness, James Darnell; is that correct, sir?

A. There is a supplement regarding information that

James Darnell called and gave me, that's correct.

Q. Do you have a copy of the report that sets out the information that your office received from James Darnell?

- A. Yes, that's the information that I typed up.
- O. Would you share that with the jury, please?

A. It says; "22:00 hours the writer received a call from a male white identifying himself as Jim Darnell, 32 years of age, date of birth, 2-17-65. Social security number 414-94-2007, home address 7270 Stomford, S-T-O-M-F-O-R-D, Drive, Germantown, Tennessee, which is actually his parents address. Home phone number 754-2989, work is currently, or at that time, is in the Army stationed in Hawaii.

Darnell advised that he and a female white, Dixie Roberts, went to the motel on 2-8-97 around 1:45 to 2:00 a.m. He pulled up in front of the check-out window, saw a male white bleeding from his hands and another male white on the other side of the check out glass and office area, with also, what appeared to be blood on his knuckles.

He described the first male white outside the checkout window as being about 23 to 24 years of age, red hair, long, wearing a ball cap, orange, with a white adjustable band on the back, blue jeans and a tee shirt with the sleeves cut off, or rolled up.

He was very drunk and had numerous freckles on his arms. The subject was described to have blood dripping from

Page 719

J

his knuckles.

The second male white, who Darnell believed to have been the clerk, was described as being about 30 years of age, brown hair and mustache, long hair, wearing a dark colored jacket and blue jeans. The subject also looked as if his knuckles were bleeding, but not as bad as the first subject.

Darnell stated that he stood there, but as he stood there he observed the male white, he believed to be the clerk, hand some money through the check out window to the other subject, both dollar bills and some change.

He thought that the two had gotten into a fight and that the clerk was attempting to get the guy to leave, or give him back his money.

He did advise that it was strange that neither had any injuries to their face and weren't bleeding from anywhere other than their hands.

He advised that he became very uncomfortable and decided to leave and go somewhere else. When he got to his car he did mention to Dixie that the two guys were bleeding from their knuckles and he had advised that he had just found out about the clerk missing from the hotel the day before and wanted to call before he left to go to Hawaii.

Darnell further advised that he might be able to identify the two male whites that he saw in the motel on 2/8 of '97, if he saw them again.

He further advised that there was a vehicle that was backed in front of the night entrance when he went inside. He described this vehicle as being a black, or a dark colored, possibly, Toyota, with light colored interior, being a fairly newer model vehicle.

Darnell advised that he could come to the homicide office in the morning and give a statement about what he observed, 2/13/97, end of summary".

- Q. 2/13/97, what does that date indicate?
- A. That indicates the date that he was going to come in.
- Q. Do you know whether he did come in, or not?
- A. Yes, he came in.
- Q. And he gave a statement?
- A. Yes, he did.
- Q. Did he corroborate, basically, what you have in your report, in his statement?

MR. HENDERSON: Objection, calls for an opinion.

THE COURT: Do you want to deal with the objection?

MR. GARRETT: I'll withdraw the question.

THE COURT: Can't consider it.

Q. Were there any efforts made, Lieutenant Shemwell, to see if James Darnell could identify the individuals that he said that he saw on that evening, as just indicated in this statement that you read?

A. Yes, there was.

Q. What was done in that regard?

A. I had an investigator in my office get with the F.

B. I. agent, who was assigned, had already opened a case with the F. B. I. office, regarding the DNA evidence, to contact the Hawaii office. Sent them all photographs of everyone that we have compiled, through crime stoppers, T. F. & N. information. I think it's something like 50 something photographs. Sent them out to that agent in Hawaii to meet with Mr. Darnell. He viewed the photospread.

- Q. Did he identify anyone as being one of the individuals that he observed in the hotel on the evening in question?
- A. He could not positively identify anyone, no.
- Q. And was Mr. Michael Rimmer's photo included in that group of photos that were sent out to Hawaii for him to view?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Did you have any communication, or did your office have any communication with Mr. Darnell since the time that the photos were went out for his review?
- A. No.
- Q. Do you know, Lieutenant Shemwell, whether this information was presented in Mr. Rimmer's last trial?

MR. HENDERSON: Objection, Your Honor, that would

be irrelevant.

THE COURT: Do y'all want to respond?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Come on up.

(A bench conference was held on the record in the presence of the jury, but out of it's hearing and the following proceedings were had, to-wit:)

MR. HENDERSON: It's my position that it would be irrelevant. It's one thing to put on proof of lingering doubt. It's another thing to do it collateral attacking the verdict by a jury in front of another jury. It's like a post-conviction with a jury. I don't see how it's going to help this jury to determine whether or not what to sentence this defendant to.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond to that?

MR. SPRINGER: If I could, briefly, Your Honor. Although this is a re-sentencing hearing, we understand that this is not directed towards the original guilt evidence in the guilt or the innocent phase. This, in essence, is one trial. This is still part of the same, original trial. If testimony was given at that trial on, which is basically what all of the evidence is that we have in this resentencing, then I think that it is relevant for the purpose of the sentencing hearing. If Mr. Darnell on seeing the harm of

.

this information, whether or not it was presented, wasn't testified at the trial. I think that the way that the Court should look at it and obviously this is just my opinion is that it influences the resentencing, is we have to put ourselves in a mind-set that this is as if this trial is following immediately after the guilt, innocence phase.

Although, we have to obviously put forth, there needs to be proof, enough proof to distribute, because they didn't have the guilt or innocent phase to consider all of the other proof.

THE COURT: Sir?

MR. HENDERSON: As I understand lingering doubt, that goes to anything that shows that he's not guilty. Not that it shows that he didn't get a fair trial, that he didn't get a perfect trial, or that if they had of done it differently had they been trying it. It goes to whether or not there is proof that he didn't do it. So I think it would cause doubt as to his mental status, or something. Not just an attack on the preceding, proceedings.

MR. SPRINGER: Unfortunately, Your Honor, like I say, this jury now wasn't privy to the original trial, or privy to the transcripts of the original trial, so they don't have that. But, I think that it's important that they have enough information about that trial, on the guilt and innocence evidence, as possible. As if they had sat there.

Obviously that's not normal, but I think that it's important they get as much information so that they can consider any and all mitigating circumstances surrounding it.

MR. HENDERSON: The next step would be to let them call a lawyer in to start talking, in their opinion, about how badly the first defense lawyers did. That's just post-conviction. It has nothing to do with his actual guilt, or innocence, which is what lingering doubt is about, actual guilt, or innocence.

THE COURT: Lingering doubt is defined as that.

MR. SPRINGER: I understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I can't accept what you're doing as being lingering doubt.

MR. SPRINGER: I understand.

THE COURT: All right.

(Said bench conference having been completed, the following proceedings were had in the presence of the jury:)

- Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, you testified on direct that as the coordinator on this case, you were the person responsible for meeting with the D. A.'s office and discussing the evidence that your investigation has uncovered; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Did you also say that you would discuss with the D.

A.'s office what charges would be filed against the defendant?

- A. I present the case to the District Attorney and he decides the charge.
- Q. Did you, sir, at any time during the investigation of this case, uncover any evidence of a firearm being used in the robbery that took place at the Memphis Inn on the evening of February the 7th, or February 8th of 1997?

MR. HENDERSON: And I would object to the grounds of relevance, Your Honor. The state has not alleged any firearm on this particular indictment and that's the one that we tried and it's not relevant to the sentencing for this capital murder case.

THE COURT: Approach the bench.

(A bench conference was held on the record in the presence of the jury, but out of it's hearing and the following proceedings were had, to-wit:)

THE COURT: If I understand what the objection is, unless there is something that you can tell me, different, the objection is correct.

MR. SPRINGER: Well, the problem is that Mr. Rimmer -- part of the aggravated circumstances is that they're saying that this robbery was committed by use of a weapon, a firearm.

MR. HENDERSON: That's the definition of robbery, which does not require a firearm.

THE COURT: No.

MR. SPRINGER: According to the indictment, I'm reading in the convictions that came down as part of --

MR. HENDERSON: He was convicted of armed robbery, but the allegation for the aggravating factor is the murder was committed during the perpetration of a robbery. He was convicted of aggravated robbery and it was affirmed by the Court of Criminal Appeals. So I think that to ask somebody else if there is any evidence of a firearm, is probably going a little too far, since it's been affirmed. He absolutely, as a matter of law, was using a firearm.

MR. SPRINGER: Well see, that's the problem. I think that mitigating and residual doubt proof is very much that it goes to that. I ask Your Honor, if there hasn't been no evidence at all, deduced at the trial level, or even at the sentencing level, that there has been no use of a firearm, then I think it goes directly to residual doubt in that sense. Even if there has been a jury decision that there is --

THE COURT: And the Court of Appeals.

MR. SPRINGER: I understand that, Your Honor, but our position, though is, that there has been no one at the sentencing hearing that's testified to a firearm and based on

my reading of the transcripts, no one testified to the use of a firearm.

MR. HENDERSON: But they did. You need to read Mr. Allards (phonetically) testimony, that said the defendant shot her twice. And the jury believed that and so did the Court of Criminal Appeals.

MR. SPRINGER: Well, I think that it still goes to residual doubt. Residual doubt proof is --

THE COURT: There is no residual doubt if the Court of Appeals has accepted that man's testimony.

MR. HENDERSON: Residual doubt as to the armed robbery. We can't retry that. We have no jurisdiction to retry that. It's not relevant to the murder indictment. Murder in the perpetration is simple robbery.

THE COURT: Okay. You are welcome to preserve this for appeal.

MR. SPRINGER: Absolutely, Your Honor, if you'll just note our objection.

(Said bench conference having been completed, the following proceedings were had in the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: All right. You may proceed.

Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, did you, during your investigation of this case receive any information from any witness regarding, other than Mr. Darnell, regarding a

vehicle that was parked at the hotel on that particular evening?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And what information did you receive in that regards, sir?
- A. I received that there was a vehicle backed up at the night entrance with the door slightly opened, the interior light was on and that it was a darked colored vehicle and that the interior was a lighter colored. And that it was, possibly, the model of a Toyota, or a small model car.
- Q. And was it pulled in, or backed in?
- A. This witness advised that it was backed in.
- Q. And did they tell you anything about the trunk of that vehicle?
- A. That it was --

MR. HENDERSON: I object at this point, Your Honor, to hearsay from an anonymous source, we could be here the rest of the month. It's hearsay.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond?

MR. GARRETT: Your Honor, I thought that we had dealt with the hearsay aspect of this, for sentencing purposes that the hearsay did not apply.

THE COURT: Sir? Yes, it does. It can be relaxed, but it applies. Unless you've got a case, sir, to cite,

either one of you, I sure must have missed that.

MR. SPRINGER: Your Honor, may we approach?

THE COURT: Yeah, come on up.

(A bench conference was held on the record in the presence of the jury, but out of it's hearing and the following proceedings were had, to-wit:)

THE COURT: From the standpoint of relaxed hearsay, I accept it. Hearsay does exist.

MR. SPRINGER: Well, in my reading of the statute, the sentencing statute Teague, Hartman, Austin, everything that I've read. In fact, Austin cites the same language, it cites from Teague, the exact same language. That hearsay is admissible, notwithstanding the rules of evidence. The rules in evidence, in essence, when they said it, don't apply for the purposes of a capital murder hearing. And that is my understanding and that is a quote from Teague and that is a quote from Austin and that is a quote, also --

THE COURT: That is a quote from Teague 897 SW2nd, 248 and you're saying that it's a quote from Austin 87 SW3rd, 447?

MR. SPRINGER: Yes, Your Honor, that same language from Teague has already been --

THE COURT: That it's waived?

MR. SPRINGER: No, it's not waived.

THE COURT: It's what?

MR. SPRINGER: It says, basically, the credible evidence of the circumstances --

THE COURT: Credible?

MR. SPRINGER: Relevant.

THE COURT: Relevant?

MR. SPRINGER: Right. And I think based on the circumstances there has been evidence already in this trial that --

THE COURT: I'm telling you now that it can be relaxed, but it's got to be credible and it's got to be relevant.

MR. SPRINGER: And our contention is that it is credible and it is relevant. These are witnesses that they did their initial investigation on and based their schedule on and based on all the pursuing of their investigation. And in light of the fact the crime scene has already testified that basically there was a parking spot right as you exited that door and that the blood stain, on the ground there was right at the curb.

There is an argument, I think, that we can make and one of them is that I think it is relevant, Your Honor, based upon all the facts and circumstances if you take the totality of the testimony that's already been given and the reliability of the witnesses that have, these weren't

Page 731

witnesses.

MR. HENDERSON: Your Honor, I ask that if counsel believes that the rules of evidence regarding hearsay do not apply to this hearing, would I be allowed then to ask this officer what Ms. Frazier told him about Mr. Rimmer and the shovel.

MR. STRINGER: I don't have problem with that, if you want to argue that, if you can clarify that it's relevant and it's rebutting some evidence that we put forth, then I don't know that the Court can rule any other way.

MR. HENDERSON: So you wouldn't object to it on the basis of hearsay?

MR. STRINGER: No, no, what I'm telling you is, if you are rebutting evidence that we have put forth that is against residual doubt, then the Judge would have to follow the law in that regard.

MR. HENDERSON: If residual doubt is a defense and the hearsay rule doesn't apply, my next exhibit is this package of papers, the investigative report in this case.

I'll ask the officer to read it, beginning on page one until the end of it.

MR. SPRINGER: And we can take time out of the hearing and let the jury go and let the Judge redact whatever it is. But, I know Dixie Roberts, the individual who gave this information about the trunk being opened, testified at

trial. And she testified to that fact at trial.

THE COURT: She testified at trial?

MR. SPRINGER: Yes, she did. Dixie Roberts Presley was her name. And she testified at trial.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, why isn't she testifying this time?

MR. SPRINGER: That's your responsibility.

MR. HENDERSON: I didn't issue a subpoena. You're using her as hearsay.

MR. SPRINGER: Well we need her here in this sentencing hearing, I believe.

MR. HENDERSON: I beg to differ, Your Honor. If the rules of evidence don't apply at sentencing hearings, why do we call them hearings?

THE COURT: They do. We have to determine whether or not they're material.

MR. HENDERSON: And I'd say there's another 150 false leads out there. We'll just have to go through them one at a time.

THE COURT: No, no they don't. And it says, if relevant, I underlined, hearsay is admissible.

MR. SPRINGER: Absolutely. And I think it is.

THE COURT: And then, that is your position. If it wasn't you wouldn't be asking me questions. I understand that. And it's relevant for what purpose?

MR. SPRINGER: It's relevant because the four officers that have testified so far, testified that they went based on this maroon car description, one of which Ms. Dixie Roberts Presley testified to at trial. She initially testified to the fact that this trunk, that she saw his car backed in with the trunk opened, the door open and the lights on. That was at trial in this particular case.

THE COURT: And what?

MR. SPRINGER: I think it's relevant, because you have crime scene who testified that they followed this trail of blood all the way out, that it was on the curb, a nice amount of blood.

THE COURT: From where the car was parked?

MR. SPRINGER: Where the car was parked.

THE COURT: Why are you wanting to put it in?

MR. SPRINGER: Because, the state's proof has been that all this blood was found in the back seat of this car. If the trunk is open they find, and the crime scene officer also testified that there was no blood found on the parking lot anywhere. They searched everywhere. And if there's no blood found in the parking lot, how was this individual carried out to the parking lot, where it left blood everywhere else, but on the parking lot. But at the curb where it stopped, where there could have been a car parked. It's more likely that that individual was placed, if she was,

in deed, carried --

THE COURT: In somebody else's car?

MR. SPRINGER: In the trunk. And we say that trunk and that car didn't belong to the defendant.

THE COURT: Then why did it end up in Mr. Rimmer's car? I understand what you're saying, but it's got to be relevant.

MR. SPRINGER: Well obviously, it was relevant for the purpose of trial. I'm trying to understand why it's not relevant for the purpose of sentencing.

THE COURT: I'm going to let it in.

MR. HENDERSON: And I'm going to be able to offer this package?

MR. SPRINGER: And I'll object.

THE COURT: There you go.

MR. SPRINGER: And we may need to have a jury out motion.

THE COURT: We may, or we may not. I don't know.

It depends on what is developed during your proof. Okay?

MR. SPRINGER: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Go ahead and ask that question.

(Said bench conference having been completed, the following proceedings were had in the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Judge.

Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, did you get information from a witness regarding a description of a vehicle that was parked out at the Memphis Inn on the night in question?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And do you recall who the witness was that provided this information?
- A. I had several, but the one you're speaking of was Dixie Roberts.
- Q. Tell the jury what she told you she saw?
- A. It was the vehicle backed in at the night entrance. One of the doors was opened, or had to be open, because the interior light was on. The trunk was open and it was a dark colored vehicle, a Toyota model. She thought to be a newer model. And that the interior was lighter colored than the exterior.
- Q. You indicated that you went to Indiana and you were present when the car that Mr. Rimmer was driving was inventoried?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. And you were present when the sample was taken from the back seat that had, what appeared to be, blood stains on it?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Was the trunk of that vehicle inventoried, also?

Page 736

. ...

A. Yes, it was.

Q. Did you take any samples from the trunk of that vehicle for the purpose of identifying blood stains?

A. I recall there was a -- I want to say, a hammer, a large hammer that was in the trunk of the car, with what we thought might be blood, or hair on it. That was submitted to T. B. I. and I can't recall what else. I know the back seat had a big duffle bag on it and that was the other individual's that was hitch hiking, who was in the vehicle with Mr. Rimmer at the time. The trunk of the car, I want to say, another tote bag in there which was, I think, Mr. Rimmer's clothing.

- Q. Did you find any evidence of blood in the trunk?
- A. Not that I recall.
- Q. Now, you say the back seat had what on it?
- A. The back seat had a large, like a duffle bag, and it was my understanding it was the individual's who Mr. Rimmer was arrested with at the time. It was his. He advised that it was his bag of clothing. It was laying across the back seat of the car.
- Q. Were you there when that duffle bag was inventoried?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Was this duffle bag anywhere in the area where the blood stains were later found on the back seat?

Page 737

)

. .

24

Α.	I t	was	on	top	οf	the	blood	stains.
				· I				100 C 100 TO 100 M. A.

- Q. Can you tell this jury the stains that you're referring to as blood stains, what condition they were in? Was it wet? Was it dry? Do you know?
- A. It was dried blood.
- Q. Can you tell the jury from what portion of the seat the sample was taken from that was sent to the F. B. I. lab?
- A. I believe he cut the sample from the passenger side, rear seat. There was a photograph taken prior to that cutting and after that cutting, if I'm not mistaken.
- Q. Were you there when this car was prepared for transport back to Memphis?
- A. No, that was the Indiana investigators, I believe, met the wrecker driver.
- Q. How long were you on the scene when this vehicle was being inventoried?
- A. I was there the entire time that they inventoried it.
- Q. Tell the jury, approximately, how long that would have been?
- A. An hour, or an hour and a half, it was like. We was there for some time.
- Q. The exterior of this vehicle was what color?
- A. It was maroon.
- Q. What color was the interior?

(Whereupon, a bench conference was had on the record in the presence of the jury, but out of its hearing and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: All right. There's an objection. How does this apply to residual doubt?

MR. SPRINGER: Well I think, Your Honor, quite frankly, this officer testified that the seat where the blood stain was found was released to the state for the purposes of trial. And I think that's extremely important. They have hauled the sink in here. They have hauled various other materials in here. And they have only put up a drawn, a hand drawn photographs of this back seat area to indicate where this blood was found.

THE COURT: A co-mingling; is that what you're saying?

MR. SPRINGER: What I'm saying though is, is the relevant question in light of the fact that the only thing that the jury has seen so far, is, what the state has depicted of where this blood was and they could give a distortion of that, this seat was absolutely covered in blood, or it was a thing that was maybe five or six meters.

THE COURT: I thought that was testified to.

MR. SPRINGER: No, the only thing that was testified to was that there was blood found in various areas of the seat. But, in terms of the totality of how much blood

Page 740

_

THE COURT: Nobody asked.

MR. SPRINGER: Well, then that's --

THE COURT: Y'all have the right to cross-examine.

MR. SPRINGER: And that's what we're attempting to do now with the officer who --

THE COURT: I'm talking about from the person who took the --

MR. SPRINGER: Mr. Baldwin, my understanding is, Mr. Baldwin who was the evidence individual from Indiana, who took the sample. He's not been called to testify. The only other individual that we feel is Mr. Shemwell. Now, Lieutenant Shemwell, since he is the coordinator and he is the only one that information was transferred back to him. And since Mr. Baldwin isn't here to testify as to what he saw, I think it's only Lieutenant Shemwell, who would be the next individual who would know as much information as anybody else, to testify as to what the condition was, or where --

MR. HENDERSON: The question for you is, where is the car seat? Did they keep the car seat?

THE COURT: That's what I'm getting at. What does it matter.

MR. SPRINGER: Well, it may be something that we would have the jury see. Our problem is, the only thing that the jury --

THE COURT: Not in this part of the trial.

MR. SPRINGER: My concern is that they brought in a drawing. They brought a sink in. They brought other large items in, that I thought was just to -
THE COURT: So what you want them to go find the

car and everybody look at it, is that what you're saying?

MR. SPRINGER: No, I don't think that would -- THE COURT: What is it that you're saying?

MR, SPRINGER: I just think that it's a relevant

question for the purposes of dismissing -- we haven't been able to see it here. I mean, I think he could ask that not having the seat. I mean, I think he could ask that question and we could move on.

THE COURT: It's not an askable question.

MR. SPRINGER: I understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Objection's sustained.

(Said bench conference having been completed, the

(:Kinj

52

72

23

22

12

20

6 L

81

۷.

9١

Þ١

13

15

11

10

8

g

THE COURT: Let's move on.

Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, did you, during the investigation of this case, receive information that would lead you to believe that there were two individuals involved in the robbery of the Memphis Inn?

MR. HENDERSON: Objection, Your Honor. That calls

for conclusions, based on hearsay, anonymous tips and everything. It would be like saying, "Did you find any evidence showing he was guilty?" That's an opinion. It's irrelevant and it's not going to help this jury do their job, and that's sentence.

THE COURT: Come on back up here.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was had on the record in the presence of the jury, but out of its hearing and the following proceedings were had:)

MR. SPRINGER: Your Honor, I think this clearly

goes to the issue of residual doubt. The jury has a right to consider, if there were evidence that there were two individuals involved in this crime and one of those two individuals was not Michael Rimmer, I think that that is exactly what residual doubt is contemplated by the Supreme exactly what residual doubt is contemplated by the Supreme court in it's decision. I think anything else would be to not letting the jury consider all the facts and

circumstances of the case.

MR. HENDERSON: I thought residual doubt has to be

based on evidence?

THE COURT: It does.

MR. HENDERSON: Not on anonymous tips.

MR. SPRINGER: Well, these weren't anonymous tips.

These are people that they talked to.

These are people that they talked to.

information?" That could have been dreams, it could have been the psychic hot-line.

the question is a problem, I think the question could be rephrased, "Did you ever interview anybody who gave you any information that would lead you to believe that two

individuals were involved?"

THE COURT: All right. Let us assume that one of

MR. SPRINGER: All right, If the phraseology of

the individuals is your client. So what have we got now?

MR. SPRINGER: Well, that's obviously not our

assumption. Our assumption is that neither one of -THE COURT: No, but I'm just saying. Let's assume

that he does.

52

77

23

22

12

20

61

81

71

91

91

14

13

15

۱L

10

8

9

MR. SPRINGER: And I think that that's information that we're seeking from. I think, quite frankly, Your Honor, it's imperative, especially in light of the fact that the jury wasn't privy to the initial evidence and the testimony that was given. That they have full understanding of what the facts were and what the investigation revealed. An investigation that came from some witnesses who testified at

the initial trial.

MR. HENDERSON: You couldn't have asked that

question in the first trial,

THE COURT: No, it wasn't askable then. MR. SPRINGER: Well, maybe it isn't in the first

trial, but for sentencing purposes -THE COURT: And why is it for sentencing purposes?

MR, SPRINGER: For actual innocence evidence if

We're only concerned about whether or

there are --

not the jury has enough information to sentence Mr. Rimmer to

.gnidjemos

MR. SPRINGER: Absolutely.

THE COURT: One of the things that I put down here

from Austin, you're limited only to that -- what we've let in

so far and not vague leads.

THE COURT:

THE COURT: That's Austin, And so, what are you

MK, SPRINGER: I understand that.

Saying?

54

23

22

51

50

6١

18

21

9١

91

Þ١

15

11

10

MR, SPRINGER: I understand that. There's been no

evidence -- there were -- and just obviously this hasn't been

testified to, yet. But, there were articles ran based upon

this evidence, full scale issues to the Commercial Appeal

sbout what they thought and what this investigation was

finding. And they know, from those particular articles, that

there were two individuals, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And now you're down to citing the

Commercial Appeal as authority?

MR. SPRINGER: No, no my concern is the Commercial

Appeal got that information from somewhere and artist were

asked to identify Mr. Rimmer.

THE COURT: No, I can't handle it. No, I'm sorry,

objection's sustained.
(Said bench conference having been completed, the

following proceedings were had in the presence of the

(:Kinf

THE COURT: You may proceed.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Judge.

Q. Lieutenant Shemwell, you told us that at some point in time Ms. Ricci's husband was brought to the scene; is that

A. He was there and left prior to my arrival that

.guiniom

correct?

 $Q_{\rm s}$ Do you know what time he arrived there?

A, Not exactly, no.

Q. Do you know what time the officers went to his home

that evening, if in fact, they did?

A. They went there that morning and they was in route

while I arrived, and I arrived on the scene, probably ten minutes to 6:00 that morning, and they was already in route.

O. They were in route to his home at ten minutes 'til

A. That was the information that I had.

Q. Was Mr. Ellsworth ever considered a suspect in this

CSS6?

600:9

23

55

20

91

14

13

10

ç

Did you ever establish his whereabouts on that ٠Ò

evening at 1:30, or 2:00, or 3:00 o'clock?

Yes, the investigators woke him up and advised him

ťÒ And that would have been around 6:00 as you've just . gnissim saw oliw aid tadt

testified?

6:00 o'clock in the morning. Mr. Ellsworth was awakened by Six is what time I got there. It was long belore

the investigators and notified of this. He made the scene at

the hotel and then left, prior to my arriving first on the

scene, at ten minutes 'til 6:00 that morning.

Didn't you just tell the jury a moment ago that the

investigators were on the way to his home when you arrived at

the hotel, a little before 6:00?

Exactly. And I just said that they had already

been there, picked him up, he came to the hotel and then he

And then, they were in route, at that time when I

arrived, because he had information regarding a possible

.joedsus

52

54

53

55

12

50

61

81

4٤

91

91

ÐΙ

εı

15

10

6

ε

2

And did you tell us that the investigators went

back to his home to gather some information, or evidence?

He had information that might lead to who was

responsible for this. And that night detective was taking

Mr, Ellsworth back to his house to get that information.

That's correct,

regard?

- Q. Do you know what information was given in that
- A. I received several photographs and some kind of small date book, or some kind of book, that supposedly belonged to Michael Rimmer. And if I'm not mistaken, he was
- looking for some letter, or a letter might have been
- retrieved, that Mr. Rimmer had written to Ms. Ellsworth.
- Q, How many photographs did you retrieve?
- A. I don't recali.
- Q. What did you do with these photographs?
- A. They were tagged as evidence.
- Q. Tell the jury what was reflected, or depicted in
- these photographs?
 A. I can remember that Mr. Rimmer was in a photograph
- at the, I believe, it was either the Northwest Correctional
- Center, or the other facility nearby there, in Lake County.
- And I want to say that it was he, along with two, or maybe,
- three more inmates. There was another photograph with Ricci
- Ellsworth and Mr. Rimmer. And I don't recall if there were any other photographs, I don't remember.
- Q. But there was, at least, one in which Mr. Rimmer
- and Ms. Ellsworth were shown, together?
- A, That's correct.

52

54

23

22

12

50

46

81

9١

91

ÞΙ

13

11

10

8

9

9

Q. Did you make any determination as to when these

photographs were made?

A. I don't recall if they were dated on the back, but my information was that there was, after his conviction for raping and assaulting her, after he was sentenced, and I believe he was at Lake County. It was in his first several years that he was there.

Q. That's when these photographs would have been made?

A. That's my understanding.

Q. Did you do any investigation, Lieutenant Shemwell,

Rimmer while he was in the penitentiary?

MR. HENDERSON: Again, Your Honor, objection on the

to establish whether Ms. Ellsworth had been visiting Mr.

grounds of relevance, I'm going to object to the grounds of hearsay.

Come on up,

(Whereupon, a bench conference was had on the record in the presence of the jury, but out of its hearing and the

I mean, at this point we're at the

point of asking the witness, "What did you find out in your investigation?" How do you rebut that? I don't how a lawyer can examine that kind of question. I don't know how a lawyer can ask that kind of question. But it's clearly, I hope,

WE' HENDEESON:

THE COURT:

following proceedings were had:)

inadmissible.

THE COURT: Are you objecting to the form of the

question?

52

77

23

22

12

50

61

81

41

91

12

13

15

11

10

6

8

L

9

G

Þ

ε

5

-- Mous of

the question,

irrelevant information, as well as hearsay. would be correct answer to the question? That's calling for find out something?" Yeah, the psychic told me that, that "Did you find in your investigation irrelevant information. opinion, it calls for anonymous information and it calls for objecting to that question calls for hearsay, it calls for

MR. HENDERSON: Form of the question and I'm

There's an objection to the form of THE COURT:

got a right to rebut that aggravated circumstance by trying circumstances that they intended to prove was rape. Welve clerk read into the record, one of the aggravating that the state read into the record, or yesterday had the Your Honor, I think, quite clearly,

ME. SPRINGER:

Not after a guilty plea. THE COURT:

MR. SPRINGER: No, actually you stated rape in your involves violence and this does not rebut that conviction. that he has been convicted of a crime, the offense which

MR, HENDERSON: The aggravating circumstance is

conviction stands as it is. But, I think that we have right can't argue, we can't argue with the conviction, the aggravating circumstances were. And I think, although we opening statement, is what you stated that one of the

to rebut it. And if there is evidence that she continued to have are him and they continued to date and they continued to have a relationship after that, the jury can give whatever weight it wants to, as to whether or not the validity of those rape charges or not. But, I think that it's unfair for the state to come out and say that we're going to show that he raped

THE COURT: He didn't say that.

MR, SPRINGER: Well, one of the aggravators he

stated in his opening statement was, that he raped her.

THE COURT: He did say that in his opening

statements, but that doesn't mean that he's going to get it

, u i

her.

MR, HENDERSON; The law makes it clear that the

aggravating circumstance conviction, you cannot collaterally

attack that conviction by going behind the facts of it.

THE COURT: Now, I've got to hear some case law on

that, because that's the last that I ever read was that. You can't collaterally attack it. Especially when he pled guilty

that.

MR. GARRETT: Since the objection is to the form of

the question --

52

54

23

55

12

20

61

81

11

91

91

71

13

15

11

10

ε

THE COURT: That was one, but now we've got an

additional one, when he explains what you all are doing. And

I can tell you this, you cannot collaterally attack it.

We're not trying to attack the MK, SPRINGER:

convictions, which one of them happens to be rape. We're not the aggravating circumstances, which is one of the conviction. What we want is really rebutting simply one of

attacking the official record, we're trying to show what the

-- qidanoitalər

I don't know what you call getting ten THE COURT:

years for rape?

Well, we're just trying to establish WE SEKINGEK:

a relationship that she continued to have with him.

It ain't a mistake, when you plead THE COURT: gnilty.

That's not in question. WE' SEKINGEK:

have a right to rebut any aggravating circumstance they put conviction stands as it is. But, as we're heading there, we

And I think that if she continued to have a

they had a relationship that extended after he was released relationship with him, and it also goes to residual doubt. If

from prison, Your Honor, I think that that tends to show that

he would have been less likely to, absent any proof, that

there was some strained tension between him, as of one time

after he was released, before this happened.

ME, HENDERSON: And we'll try every prior too,

aggravated assult in 1985 and start litigating the facts of under that theory of residual doubt. We can go back to the 52

54

22

12

20

61

81

41

91

91

11

13

15

11

10

9

ε

7

that and that's where this leads to and that's why it is not admissible.

MR, GARRETT: If I may add, Your Honor. The state has put on proof regarding -- brought in witnesses from the

penitentiary to testify regarding threats that were made.

commit this murder while he sat in prison. I think that as

that same period of time, that Ms. Ellsworth was visiting him, that it rebuts this contention that he had this sinister plan to do her harm, once he is released from prison. Or, at least the jury could draw that conclusion, or that inference

from this testimony.

THE COURT:

objection. You want to respond to that?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, because the testimony also was

that he got mad when she quit coming to see him and that's when he said he was going to kill her. So this doesn't rebut

MR, GARRETT: The jury can weigh that and decide

So now there's another response to your

whether it does, or whether it does not. I think it's relevant for that purpose and the weight that's to be given to it is for the jury.

MR, HENDERSON: Is there anything that is not

relevant?

. tadt

52

77

23

22

51

50

61

81

۷.

9٤

9٤

Þ١

٤L

15

11

01

THE COURT: Yeah,

MR, HENDERSON: Well, I can't wait to see what it is. So far they've taken the position that anything that they want to ask this officer, "What did you find out as a result of your investigation?" And he could answer this question truthfully by saying, yes --

THE COURT: No, he can't.

the way that that question was raised, he could.

though he may not even be able to tell you, yet, I don't know. You can ask him, but you're stuck with the answer.

(Said bench conference having been completed, the following proceedings were had in the presence of the

(:Ainf

52

23

55

12

61

81

41

91

ÞL

13

15

11

01

5

(End of Volume Five)